

257

HISTORY and ROMANCE

in Graeco-Oriental Literature

By MARTIN BRAUN

Ph.D. (Cantab.), D.Phil. (Heidelberg)

With a Preface by

Professor ARNOLD TOYNBEE

408046
17.12.42

BASIL BLACKWELL · OXFORD · 1938

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface by Professor A. J. Toynbee	ix
Acknowledgments	xiii
Chapter I: The National Character of Hero Romance	1
Ninus and Semiramis	6
Sesostris	13
Nectanebus	19
Moses	26
Alexander	31
Chapter II: Biblical Legend in Jewish-Hellenistic Literature with special Reference to the Treat- ment of the Potiphar Story in the Testament of Joseph	44
Index	105

PREFACE

THE present book communicates the results of researches which are pioneer work in a *terra incognita*; and to see the book in print is a particular pleasure to the writer of this preface because, through the author's courtesy, he had an opportunity of consulting the book in typescript, before its publication, when he was at work on a kindred study of his own, and this consultation made him aware of the value of Dr. Braun's work for students in more than one field of literary and social history. To all such scholars the book will now happily be accessible.

The blanks on the map that are apt to yield the most fruitful results to the explorer are those which lie, like Arabia, within a stone's throw of the world's busiest thoroughfares. Dr. Braun's field of research is a territory of this kind. It marches with the minutely-surveyed domain of the study of the New Testament and of the genesis of Christianity, as an unknown Arabia marches with a familiar Palestine. Dr. Braun's discoveries in his *terra incognita* will be of special interest to New Testament scholars; and at the same time they will be of general interest to students of the psychological and social effects of collisions between different civilizations. A collision between Judaism and Hellenism was the historical circumstance out of which Christianity emerged, and this is one conspicuous and momentous instance of a historical phenomenon which has also occurred in other times and places as the result of similar contacts between other diverse cultures. On this wider field of study, too, Dr. Braun's researches throw welcome light.

The historical importance and spiritual fruitfulness of the collision between Hellenism and its Oriental neighbours are, of course, commonplaces. When we watch Greek science and philosophy captivating the minds of the subjects of the Abbasid Caliphs in the ninth and tenth centuries of the

Christian Era, and likewise when we watch Christianity conquering the hearts of the citizens of the Roman Empire in the third and fourth centuries, we are aware that these great spiritual events are in some sense the distant results of the physical conquest of the Achaemenian Empire by Alexander the Great many centuries earlier; and we infer that such vast effects on the visible surface of life must be the outcome of some long travail in the depths. Dr. Braun takes us down to this obscure lower level, and thereby enables us to trace the spiritual commerce between Hellenism and the Oriental cultures up the stream of time, through the last two or three centuries B.C., back almost to the morrow of Alexander's day.

At the level of social life which is Dr. Braun's sphere of research, the human spirit does not express itself through the conscious art of a sophisticated literature. The medium of expression and tradition here is the folk-tale; and this has its own specific laws of birth and growth. Dr. Braun's readers will find themselves exploring, under his guidance, a mental world which is not unlike that which is the nursery of epic poetry. There is, however, one capital point of difference which makes Dr. Braun's work more difficult—and, by the same token, perhaps more interesting—than the study of those 'heroic ages' from which epic poetry springs. The heroic society which expresses itself in epic poetry is a barbarian world with no crust of civilization overlying it. By contrast, the folk-tale takes shape in an underworld that is overlaid by another social stratum which is sophisticated as well as dominant. An apter simile would be that of the different layers of water in the sea; for in human life, as in hydrodynamics, there is movement all the time, and the different social levels are in constant intercommunion. From the self-conscious level that is exposed to the light and air, elements are constantly sinking into the sub-conscious depths, and undergoing a weird 'sea-change' in the process; and, conversely, these depths are constantly throwing their creations up to a surface where these deep-sea creatures startle the observer by the beauty or the horror of the force that they bring with them from the hidden underworld out of which they rise.

This creative circulation of the waters of life from the surface down to the depths, and then from the depths up to the surface again, is illustrated by the theme of Dr. Braun's study; and this is perhaps the most attractive and suggestive of the many new things which his work brings to light.

ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE,
Ganthorpe,
11th June, 1938.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE kindness of Professor Toynbee in providing this book with a preface leaves me free to devote myself to the pleasant task of expressing my deeply-felt gratitude to those without whose help the book could not have been written. First of all, I must take this opportunity of thanking Mr. H. M. J. Loewe, M.A., whose good offices made it possible for me to continue at Cambridge during the years 1934-6 researches begun in Germany, and who during that period never failed to give me his help and encouragement. My thanks are due also to the Professional Committee in London, and especially to Mr. A. J. Makower, M.A., and to Mr. O. M. Schiff for the practical assistance which they so readily gave me. It is my privilege, further, to acknowledge the aid of the Hort Memorial Fund. I am greatly indebted to those scholars who have helped me in various ways, among whom I may mention Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, M.A., Mr. F. H. Colson, M.A., Professor E. Fraenkel, Canon W. L. Knox, Professor A. D. Nock, Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, M.A., Professor D. S. Robertson.

In 1936 Manchester College, Oxford, to which this book is dedicated, very generously awarded me a senior research studentship which has enabled me to revise the work done in Cambridge. As in Cambridge, so in Oxford I have been the recipient of many kindnesses. Above all, I wish to record my deepest gratitude to Principal J. H. Weatherall, to whose interest and encouragement the publication of this book is mainly due.

It gives me great pleasure to thank those friends who both in Cambridge and in Oxford have helped me in matters of English style. While they are too numerous to mention specifically, I am particularly indebted to Mrs. Nora Robbins, the Rev. E. J. R. Cook and Mr. R. Fargher, B.A.

Finally, I must acknowledge the courtesy of the Editors of the Loeb Classical Library in allowing me to quote from the Loeb series.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE kindness of Professor Toynbee in providing this book with a preface leaves me free to devote myself to the pleasant task of expressing my deeply-felt gratitude to those without whose help the book could not have been written. First of all, I must take this opportunity of thanking Mr. H. M. J. Loewe, M.A., whose good offices made it possible for me to continue at Cambridge during the years 1934-6 researches begun in Germany, and who during that period never failed to give me his help and encouragement. My thanks are due also to the Professional Committee in London, and especially to Mr. A. J. Makower, M.A., and to Mr. O. M. Schiff for the practical assistance which they so readily gave me. It is my privilege, further, to acknowledge the aid of the Hort Memorial Fund. I am greatly indebted to those scholars who have helped me in various ways, among whom I may mention Mr. M. P. Charlesworth, M.A., Mr. F. H. Colson, M.A., Professor E. Fraenkel, Canon W. L. Knox, Professor A. D. Nock, Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, M.A., Professor D. S. Robertson.

In 1936 Manchester College, Oxford, to which this book is dedicated, very generously awarded me a senior research studentship which has enabled me to revise the work done in Cambridge. As in Cambridge, so in Oxford I have been the recipient of many kindnesses. Above all, I wish to record my deepest gratitude to Principal J. H. Weatherall, to whose interest and encouragement the publication of this book is mainly due.

It gives me great pleasure to thank those friends who both in Cambridge and in Oxford have helped me in matters of English style. While they are too numerous to mention specifically, I am particularly indebted to Mrs. Nora Robbins, the Rev. E. J. R. Cook and Mr. R. Fargher, B.A.

Finally, I must acknowledge the courtesy of the Editors of the Loeb Classical Library in allowing me to quote from the Loeb series.

CHAPTER I

THE NATIONAL CHARACTER OF HERO ROMANCE

THE Hellenistid era was full of the most violent national tensions and conflicts. A new phenomenon emerged in the ancient world. At the instigation of Alexander and his successors, a wide net of Greek cities was spread over the various Oriental nations. The lot of the vanquished was not—as in the days of the Assyrians and Babylonians—annihilation or, in more favourable circumstances, an existence far away from the conqueror, but political, economic and moral oppression within the immediate grasp of the conqueror. The Greek cities were like thorns in the flesh of the Oriental nations. Never before had the ancient East been subjected to such enormous alien pressure. This pressure became permanent.

Yet another factor must be taken into consideration. The *horizontal* tension between Greeks and Orientals was not the only one which made itself felt in the Hellenistic East. In addition, there were *vertical* cleavages perpetuated chiefly by the kingdoms of the Diadochi. The old rivalries, suppressed by the Persian rule, flared up with renewed force; above all the secular antagonism between Mesopotamia and Egypt continued in the struggle between Seleucidae and Ptolemies. It is easily comprehensible that both dynasties should have tried to utilize the national feeling and the inherited antipathies of their subjects for their policy of expansion. But according to the principle *divide et impera*, it was also advisable to keep the various nations in a constant state of tension towards each other, as for instance in the case of Egypt, where Greeks, Egyptians and Jews lived together. Thus the Hellenistic world presents a picture which resembles that of Europe to-day: never before had the *oikoumene* been so unified in customs

and outlook, and never more disrupted in its political and national aspect.

Various nations, as we shall see, had already reacted to the Persian overlordship by the creation of national heroic myths or 'romances'. It is, therefore, easy to visualize how much more strongly, under the briefly sketched conditions of the Hellenistic Age, the national tensions and problems must have left their mark on Oriental fiction. In Hellenistic times, more than ever, the Oriental longed for edification and consolation, for the revival of his self-esteem and pride, for appeasement of his hatred and contempt, or, where the tensions were less acute, for equality with the ruling people.

Apparently, however, only a few nations were capable of setting up any active moral resistance to this alien pressure and of creating a literature filled with their own demands and ideals. In most of the cases of which we are aware, consciousness of nationality had a very obscure existence in the rural population, and it was not until later, within Christianity and its sects, that some nationalities achieved a degree of moral and literary self-expression. Other literatures have disappeared, but one would misconceive the historical picture if one did not reckon with their existence.

Above all we must take into account the literary production of Syria and Mesopotamia. It is sufficient here to recall the fact that the Jews had already developed an Aramaic literature in post-exilic pre-Christian times, which would have been impossible, if, in its own linguistic domain, Aramaic had not long since attained the rank of a literary language. Josephus published in Aramaic the first version of his *Jewish War* which was intended for the peoples of Syria and Mesopotamia.¹ In this connection the Book of Ahikar must be mentioned. It is the only Aramaic literary product of non-Jewish origin which, dating from pre-Christian times, is still known to us to any extent.² As the Elephantine Papyri show, the Book of Ahikar was already in Persian times (fifth century B.C.) read by Jews in Egypt, and it is made evident by the Book of Tobit and the Greek tradition of Akicharos-Akikaros-Achaikaros and the

¹ Bell, I, §§3, 6.

² See E. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, 1912, pp. 102-128.

later folk-lore,¹ that the fame of the wise Ahikar survived even in the succeeding centuries. The Ahikar Novel is known to be a didactic book, and as E. Meyer rightly points out,² it is quite colourless in its national and religious aspect, and is thus symptomatic of the progressing cultural adaptation and mutual assimilation of the nations in the Near East under the Persian rule. But under this international surface were hidden strong national antagonisms of which we shall find traces in the novelistic literature. The conclusion, that later, in the Hellenistic Age, the literary production of Syria and Mesopotamia assumed more than ever a national tendency, becomes obvious when dealing with the analogous cases of the Egyptians and Jews, and it may be even further confirmed with the aid of the meagre material at our disposal.

Here a digression must be made. On the whole there are two distinct strata within 'national' literature. The one emerges from the better educated and socially superior class of the subjected people, whose spokesmen, mostly priests or their descendants, display to the foreign ruling class the great antiquity, virtues and achievements of their own nation. At the same time, they fight for 'truth' against current rumours and lies. They are personalities of repute and social dignity who, while defending their own people, also enter the service of the Greek or Roman rulers.

In the other stratum which emerges from the masses of the vanquished nation, national history is not recorded for foreign consumption, nor is it designed to serve 'truth' by historical research. Here the mental state of an Oriental people, its ideals, needs, wishes and hopes achieve their self-expression. History becomes legend and myth. Legends grow and are combined together to form something which can be called romance. This popular narrative literature is the spiritual bread without which no proud people can stand the pressure of alien domination, and it is individual heroic figures in whom the feeling and longing of the masses come to a concentrated expression. As the historians

¹ *The Story of Ahikar from the Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Turkish, Greek and Slavonic Versions*, by F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris, and Agnes Smith Lewis, 2nd ed., 1913.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 113 ff.

of the former class argue against one another, in spite of their common bond against certain beliefs of Greek historians, so in the popular sphere of literature, which is characterized by anonymity, each hero has a counter-hero. Among these heroes and their romances compete strongly with each other and so reveal the national antagonisms of the Hellenistic Orient. What is associated with the story of one figure is soon attributed to another, and while they attempt to surpass each other in deeds and qualities they finally display a number of identical qualities and deeds. The common Oriental inheritance of culture, the similar political and moral situation, the same influence by Hellenistic world-literature, and the mutual antagonism between the Oriental nations combine to produce a striking similarity in romances dealing with national heroes.

As regards the former, the high literary class, we may confine ourselves to a brief survey. Its chief representative in the kingdom of the Seleucidae is the Babylonian Berossus, priest of Bel, who dedicated his historical work entitled '*Βαβυλωνιακά*' to Antiochus I Soter (281/0-262/1 B.C.); that is to say, he dedicated it 'to the man who restored the temple of Nebo in Borsippa. In a sense it belongs as much to the policy of the Seleucidae as Manetho's to that of the Ptolemies.¹ The Egyptian Manetho, originating from Sebennytus, was high priest of Heliopolis, and dedicated his '*Αιγυπτιακά*' to King Ptolemy Philadelphus.² In his historiographical as in his theological activities he displays a patriotism in which Ptolemaic and national Egyptian aspirations are mingled; for none other than Manetho was responsibly concerned with the introduction from Sinope of the statue of Sarapis, that new Graeco-Egyptian deity in which the kingdom of the Ptolemies achieved its religious incarnation. There is no doubt that the approximately contemporary works of Berossus and Manetho compete with each other as much as the two kingdoms of the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies. In the Jewish world their counterpart is chiefly the works of Flavius Josephus, the 'priest' from Jerusalem, who wielded his pen no less to

¹ E. Schwartz in *R. E.* (= Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*), III., p. 314.

² See R. Laquer in *R. E.*, XIV., pp. 1060 ff.

the greater glory of Judaism than to that of Rome and the Flavians. His competitive nationalism, directed chiefly against Greeks and Egyptians, is too well-known to need more than a passing mention.

We come now to the immediate subject of our interest, the popular anonymous literature of fiction in the Hellenistic world.

Plutarch in *De Is. et Osir.* (24, 360 B) supplies us with a suitable introduction, in which the hero-stories or hero-romances of several nations are enumerated: 'However, mighty deeds of Semiramis are celebrated among the Assyrians, and mighty deeds of Sesostrius in Egypt, and the Phrygians, even to this day, call brilliant and marvellous exploits "manic" because Manes, one of their early kings, proved himself a good man and exercised a vast influence among them. . . . Cyrus led the Persians, and Alexander the Macedonians, in victory after victory, almost to the ends of the earth.' In this chapter we shall have to deal at some length with Semiramis, Sesostrius, and Alexander. The fact that the Jews and their national hero, Moses, are not mentioned might be an accident but might, with greater probability, point to the gulf between the Jewish and the non-Jewish world. No Jewish figure has gained admittance into the literary pantheon of cosmopolitan Hellenism, while, according to Lucian's evidence (*Pseudolog.* 25), the Assyrian hero Ninus was, along with Metiochus the Phrygian, and Achilles the Greek, amongst the most popular dramatic personages. Without the remark of Plutarch we should not know that the Phrygians derived much entertainment from the deeds of the admirable and mighty King Manes, and thus one can conceive how much of the national traditions has been lost to us. One would not imagine from the two references to Manes in Herodotus (I. 94, IV. 45) that a whole cycle of tales is hidden behind that name, tales which have naturally been further developed in post-Herodotean times.¹ Unlike the other hero-figures mentioned by Plutarch, Manes was probably originally a deity from Asia Minor who was transformed into the first king of the Phrygian primeval period. An inscription from Anabura,

¹ Cf. Dionys. Hal. *Ant.* I. 27.1.

published by W. M. Ramsay, shows that his fame still flourished in Phrygia in the first century A.D., a very welcome confirmation of Plutarch's evidence.¹

NINUS AND SEMIRAMIS

If we are not entirely mistaken, the figures of Ninus and Semiramis form the centre of a large narrative cycle which originated in Syria and Mesopotamia. Unfortunately, we can only very inadequately follow its development into a romance. As Herodotus has deprived us of his 'Assyrian history' (I. 184), we learn hardly anything from him about the deeds and fate of Ninus and Semiramis. What we do know about these two rulers emerges chiefly from the report of Ctesias, the physician-in-chief of Artaxerxes Mnemon (ruling since 404 B.C.). Though one or another detail in the account of Ctesias-Diodorus (II. 1 ff.) may be due to individual invention and embellishment, the fundamental substance of the tradition must originate from popular narratives. M. Duncker and after him C. F. Lehmann-Haupt have suggested Medo-Persian epics and legends,² while E. Schwartz thinks of Ionian tales.³ No one will deny the possibility that these peoples, too, have contributed something to the stories of Ninus and Semiramis, but one must not overlook the chief bearers of the tradition, the Syrian-Mesopotamian peoples from whom Ninus and Semiramis can be no more dissociated than Siegfried, Kriemhild, Gunther or Dietrich-Theodoric from the Germans. It would also be erroneous to think that the rulership of a woman was too shameful a thing to be glorified by her own people. This corresponds to the Greek and Roman,⁴ but by no means to the Oriental, attitude. The memory of Semiramis was as dear to the Syrian-Mesopotamian peoples, as was that of Dido-Elissa to the Carthaginians.

¹ *Athenische Mitteilungen*, VIII., 1883, pp. 72-3, and *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXXVIII., 1918, pp. 148-9.

² M. Duncker, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 5th ed., 1878, II., pp. 13 ff. Lehmann-Haupt in Roscher's *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, IV., Pt. 690-4.

³ *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*, 1896, p. 74.

⁴ Compare Tacitus, *Agricola*, 16.

It is the religious spirit of Syria and Babylonia, the spirit of Ishtar, the goddess of love and war, which is embodied in Semiramis, the founder of Babylon and of an empire, and the amorous woman. The fact that she kills her innumerable lovers is a well-known *motif* in the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh, and reveals her Ishtar nature.¹ It also becomes apparent from Diodorus that Syria was the home of legendary development: Semiramis is regarded as the daughter of the Syrian goddess Derceto² and a Syrian youth (II. 4.2 f.), her name is explained as meaning 'dove' in the language of the Syrians (4.6), and Onnes, her first husband, is governor of all Syria (5.1).³

It is to Lehmann-Haupt's credit to have proved the historical reality of Semiramis, as far as such proof is at all possible. In her he has recognized Sammu-ramat, the wife of the Assyrian King Shamshi-Adad (826-811), son of the famous Shalmaneser III (860-826), a woman who as Queen Consort and mother of Adad-nirari III (809-782) must have played a prominent part in the destinies of the then united countries of Assyria and Babylonia. If this identification is correct, we are confronted with the fact that a historical person has been transformed into a mythical, and sooner or later into a novelistic figure. In the report of Ctesias-Diodorus historical, mythical and novelistic elements are combined rather incoherently, and therefore the picture of Semiramis lacks unity. But judging from the

¹ Diod. II. 13.4. See Lehmann-Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 692. Compare the similar behaviour of Semiramis' mother, the goddess Derceto, who kills her lover (Diod. II. 4.3).

² The fame of Ascalon as a centre of Aphrodite (i.e., Astarte) and Derceto worship (Diod. II. 4.2 f.) may explain why Semiramis came to be linked up with Derceto. It is, perhaps, in place to quote here what Herodotus (I. 105) remarks about the temple of Aphrodite in Ascalon: 'This temple, as I learn from what I hear, is the oldest of all the temples of the goddess, for the temple in Cyprus was founded from it, as the Cyprians themselves say; and the temple on Cythera was founded by Phoenicians from this same land of Syria.' Besides Ascalon, Semiramis was connected with still another Syrian city famous for its cult of the great mother-goddess, namely, Hierapolis-Bambyce: she was believed to have founded there the temple of Atargatis-Derceto (pseudo-Lucian, *De Syria Dea*, 14), and her statues could be admired outside the temple (39, 40, cf. 33).

³ According to Justin, XXXVI. 2.1, Semiramis hailed from Damascus, Syriae nobilissima civitas. If the account of Ctesias-Diodorus can be regarded as a sort of Vulgate of the Semiramis legend, it strikes one that, according to this version, Semiramis does not come from a Mesopotamian city but from Ascalon in Palestine. This may be taken as indicative of the cultural syncretism among the Syrian-Mesopotamian peoples within the Persian empire.

Alexander Romance, this lack of unity is very characteristic of Hellenistic-Oriental fiction, and predestined Semiramis to become a great figure of romance; for the historical element appealed to the national feeling, the mythical to the need for religious background, and the novelistic to the desire for entertainment amongst the masses in the kingdom of the Seleucidae. If we further imagine that, under the rationalizing and humanizing influence of the Greek spirit, the miraculous mythical events regarding the birth and passing of Semiramis have been eliminated and that her amorous and at the same time brutal Ishtar nature has been radically idealized and raised to a sentimental sphere, then we are confronted with a heroine typical of the Greek Romance. It is also most important that Syrian Greeks and Hellenized Syrians alike could feel a warm interest in a Semiramis figure thus transformed. In fact, she has developed on these lines, but we cannot establish the individual phases of this literary development. Before we study the Semiramis of the later Greek romance, we must, however, consider Ninus.

Ninus, the *Heros Eponymos* of Nineveh (*ἡ Νίvos*), is the typical city and empire builder in whose deeds is epitomized the entire history of Assyria. Under what conditions could such a figure who is no more than the personification of the homonymous city come to life? When could Ninus, the representative of Assyria, be combined with Semiramis, the representative of Babylonia, into a dual figure? When could the history of Assyria and Babylonia, so full of the everlasting struggle between the two peoples for predominance in Mesopotamia, appear in the idealizing and harmonizing light of Legend? We must bear in mind that the Assyrian King Sennacherib destroyed Babylon in 689. On the other hand, the Median King Cyaxares was allied to Babylon (it had been rebuilt under Esar-Haddon), when in 612 he destroyed Nineveh. In 539 Babylon itself was conquered by Cyrus. That is the result of the historical development: Nineveh destroyed, Babylon deprived of its independence, Mesopotamia a part of the Persian empire. It was because of the yoke of the Persian domination that the old Assyrian-Babylonian antagonism was wiped out. At that time the

subjugated peoples hailed in Ninus, the Assyrian, and in Semiramis, the Babylonian,¹ the exponents of their national feeling—effigies, so to speak, of the great past of the two-river country. In our view, it is not through the Medes and Persians but rather in opposition to them that they became the central figures of a legendary cycle. Ninus could achieve popularity in Babylonia too, since Nineveh-Ninus had been laid in ruins. And his union with Semiramis was all the more easy, as Ishtar, with whom Semiramis was identified, was the principal goddess of Nineveh. No wonder that Ninus, a shadowy figure from the realm of national abstraction, is much less colourful than Semiramis who could draw individual forces from an old mythical and historical figure.² It is significant that he only gains a more personal colour from his amorous connections with her. This notwithstanding, united to her, he was as an emblem of national greatness the ideal hero for a cycle of legends, and later, in our opinion, for a popular romance. In the time of Ctesias, Semiramis, and in her retinue Ninus as well, had gained citizenship in Syria. The subject-matter of Ninus and Semiramis became of renewed topical interest in Hellenistic times, when the national tensions reappeared with great violence. We may assume that Syrian national pride found satisfaction in military conquest, while Syrian taste for erotics found it in love intrigues. These are the factors which qualified the tales of Ninus and Semiramis to become a 'romance,' rather than, as K. Kerényi thinks,³ a myth of death and resurrection which occurs in the Semiramis tradition.

The Hellenistic-Oriental folk-story of Ninus and Semiramis whose existence we may also infer from literary analogies has been raised to the level of the Greek Romance about the first century B.C. The so-called Ninus Romance, the fragments of which were first published by U. Wilcken, serves

¹ Cf. ps.-Lucian, *De Syria Dea*, 14. See Lehmann-Haupt, *op. cit.*, pp. 681 f. He also points out that a gate of Semiramis existed in Babylon (Herod. III. 155, cf. I. 184) which must have been identical with the gate of Ishtar. This is good evidence for the identification of Semiramis and Ishtar and for the popularity of the former in Babylon.

² At the same time it is, of course, a historical echo in the legend that Ninus is overshadowed by Semiramis, and Nineveh by Babylon; for Nineveh-Ninus was in ruins, while Babylon continued to exist and play an important part.

³ *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 1927, p. 245.

to introduce us, in language and style, in moral and religious aspect, to the series of Greek romances.¹

When compared with the account given in Ctesias-Diodorus, we observe that in the romance such a radical transformation of the characters has taken place, that we must assume intermediate steps of development which have been lost to us.² Ninus has become an adolescent world conqueror of seventeen years who is deeply distressed because he cannot marry the girl he loves, as she is only thirteen years old. It is his cousin, the daughter of his aunt Derceia, therefore no other than Semiramis. As the goddess Derceto has been transformed into Derceia, of the motherly and aunt-like affections, so the Ishtarian Semiramis has become a shy, bashful maiden, whose tearfulness reduces her to silence. It is evident that the rationalization and humanization of the Oriental heroic figures results also in their adaptation to the attitude and outlook of the middle classes.³

Further comparison reveals other interesting points of contact from which we can infer the continuity of the narrative material.

The Ninus of the Oriental story also had great difficulties in making Semiramis his wife: she was already the spouse of another, of Onnes, and he loved her too passionately to bear the separation from her. Only when Onnes had hanged himself in despair under the king's threat to blind him, could Ninus take her as his bride (Diod. II. 6.5 ff.). What, in the Ninus Romance, has taken the place of this typically Oriental conflict between sultan and vassal is the conflict between the young lovers, on the one hand, and the ἀγραφος νόμος, on the other, which prohibits marriage before completion of the fifteenth year.⁴ Like the antithesis νόμος—φύσις (A. III.

¹ A good introduction to the problems of the Ninus Romance will be found in R. M. Rattenbury's study 'Traces of Lost Greek Novels,' in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, 3rd series, edited by J. U. Powell, 1933, pp. 211-9.

² Cf. Diod. II. 20.3 ff. U. Wilcken in *Hermes*, XXVIII, 1893, p. 188.

³ A forerunner of the Greek Novel, also in this respect, is Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, where Cyrus as a boy is idealized as a model child, but as a man becomes a typical Greek citizen and philosopher.

⁴ A. II. 36 ff., III. 1 ff., p. 5 in Lavagnini's edition of *Eroticorum Fragmenta Papyracea*. Compare M. Braun, *Griechischer Roman und hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung* (Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike, VI., 1934), p. 84, note 1.

4 f., p. 5 Lav.), it is also a Greek idea that the world conqueror should come into conflict with the νόμος to which he, too, is subjected. So far as I can ascertain, a similar conflict between an Oriental despot and the νόμος first occurs in Herodotus: the Persian King Cambyses wishes to marry his sister contrary to all usage, and the royal judges empower him to do so by virtue of another νόμος, namely, that the Persian king can do as he likes (III. 31). Apart from the Ninus Romance, this conflict recurs later in Charito:¹ the Persian sovereign has fallen violently in love with Callirrhoe. As she, unfortunately, is already married, the poor monarch, not fashioned from the hard material of a David (II. Sam. xi), still less from that of the earlier Ninus (Diod. II. 6. 9 f.), finds himself in the most terrible trouble. What passion bids him to do, is forbidden to him by his respect for law and justice. He indignantly rejects the proposal to seduce the wife of another (VI. 3). Then the guileful eunuch, his confidant, discovers that Callirrhoe is, in fact, legally without a husband, as two men have marriage claims on her; the king therefore need have no legal scruples. This argument then convinces him.² When we look back upon the Onnes episode of Ctesias-Diodorus or upon the Herodotean Cambyses episode, we can easily judge how strongly the Oriental royal personages have been humanized, but also trivialized, in the Greek romances under the influence of popular philosophical views, in this case, on the law-abiding king in contrast to the lawless tyrant. Again the Greek Novel mirrors the outlook of the middle classes.³

Ninus' campaign against Armenia, to which are dedicated the fragments B. I conl., II, III (pp. 12-15 Lav.), is also

¹ The assumption that Charito has here made use of a Herodotean narrative motif gains ground when we see that yet another incident of the Herodotean Cambyses story appears in his work. Cambyses, infuriated, kicks his pregnant wife who is his sister, which results in her death (Herod. III. 32). Just as brutal is the treatment meted out by the jealous Chaereas to his pregnant wife, which brings about her apparent death (Charito, I. 4.12, 5.1). I owe to Mr. M. P. Charlesworth the suggestion that this Herodotean motif took on fresh topicality because of an event of the near past. Nero killed Poppaea by kicking her when she was with child (Suetonius, *Nero* 35.3; Tacitus, *Annals*, XVI. 6). Compare also Kerényi, *op. cit.*, pp. 252 f. For another instance of Charito copying Herodotus see Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

² Charito, VI. 4.8. Cf. Philo, *De Abr.* §94.

³ Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 1926, p. 110 ff.

reported in Ctesias-Diodorus (II. 1.8 f.). This report is only brief in comparison to the later romance, but broad and detailed compared to the roll of names of the other vanquished nations. Apart from the Armenians, only the Medes are outstanding (II. 1.10). The conclusion is obvious, and has duly been drawn by Lehmann-Haupt,¹ that while most of the other nations are only lined up in accordance with the cliché of a world empire, in the time of Sammuramat Armenians and Medes really occupied the attention of the Assyrian kingdom, and that, therefore, in Ctesias and the Ninus Romance an erratic block of real history has come to light. As proved by the difference in the characters (Ninus, Semiramis, Derceto-Derceia), the Ninus Romance is independent of Ctesias. Consequently we are inclined to think that the tradition of the Armenian campaign reached the Hellenistic period by still other channels than that of Ctesias. As we remarked before, we must reckon with a book of Oriental folk-lore.

In the Egyptian campaign also the Ninus Romance is in agreement with the other tradition. But while in Diod. II. 2.3 (cf. Justin, I. 1.6) the conquest of Egypt is only casually mentioned, it appears to have played a considerable part in the Ninus Romance. This inference is drawn from the context in which Ninus alludes to the campaign,² a speech to the troops during the Armenian campaign,³ a speech whose import is evidently the following: in the case of a defeat we have everything to lose, when victorious, everything to gain (B. III. 34 ff., p. 15 Lav.): ἀπὸ τῆσδε τῆς [ἡμέρας] | ἢ ἀρξομαι τιτος μεί[ζονος] | ἢ πεπαύσομαι καὶ τῆς νῦν ἀρχῆς. | τῶν γὰρ ἐπ' Αἰγυπτί[ο]υς πόνων καὶ τὰ τῆς ἄλλης πολέμ[ικ]ης . . .]. Thus Ninus emphasizes and singles out his enterprise against the Egyptians from all his other undertakings in this military speech, which is attuned to the note 'To be or not to be', and in which he somehow draws up the balance-sheet of his military operations. The context implies past and not future warfare.⁴ Though the Ninus

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 687 ff.

² Compare the speech of the Assyrian king to his troops in Xenophon, *Cyrop.* III. 3.44 f.

³ Cf. A. II. 8 ff., pp. 3 f.; A. V. 17 ff., p. 9 Lav. On this question U. Wilcken has adopted too sceptical a point of view (*Hermes*, XXVIII., 1893, p. 186).

Romance was read in Egypt during the early centuries of the Roman Empire, the prominence given to the conquest of Egypt by the Assyrian-Syrian national hero discloses that Hellenistic Syria is the land of its origin.

L. Levi and B. Lavagnini have with a certain reserve submitted the view that the author of the Ninus Romance might be identical with a certain Xenophon of Antiochia of whom Suidas says: *ἱστορικός. Βαβυλωνιακός. ἔστι δὲ ἐρωτικός*.¹ This hypothesis is, of course, quite unsupported by evidence. And yet it is desirable to recall the Suidas quotation in this connection. This quotation suggests that, apart from the serious historical work of Berossus, there was yet another work which also originated from the kingdom of the Seleucidae, or from the former kingdom, and in which the early national history had been transformed into an erotic romance. This pseudo-historiography has evidently absorbed many elements and features of Hellenistic rhetorical historiography, but at the same time it has its roots in the tradition of Oriental folk-stories.

SESOSTRIS

Like Semiramis, the Egyptian national hero Sesostris, in later sources also called Sesonchosis or Sesoosis, very probably originates as a historical figure of whom myth and legend have taken possession. As in Ninus and Semiramis, so in his person, the heroic deeds of the kings of his country have been concentrated and exaggerated to fantastic proportions. But it appears that the nucleus of the tradition is formed by the three Pharaohs of the XIIth Dynasty (twenty-first–nineteenth century B.C.) bearing the name of Senusret (the reading *Usertes* is wrong), as has been pointed out by K. Sethe and, more recently, by H. Kees.²

There is no lack of evidence, particularly for the period which is of special interest to us here, namely the Graeco-Roman, to prove that Sesostris was glorified in literature as a national hero by the Egyptians. Apart from the remark

¹ L. Levi in *Rivista di Filologia Classica*, XXIII., 1895, p. 19. B. Lavagnini, *Le Origini del Romanzo Greco*, 1922, p. 76.

² K. Sethe, *Sesostris* (Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens, II., 1900). H. Kees in *R.E.*, 2nd series, II., pp. 1861 ff.

of Plutarch already quoted (p. 5), Diodorus is most illuminating (I. 53.1): '... but also among the Egyptians the priests and the poets who sing his praises give conflicting stories...' Diodorus thus distinguishes the priestly from the poetical traditions about Sesostriis, and this itself indicates that prose narratives were in existence. However, we must not stress the distinction too much, or confine the prose versions to the priests. It is also important to note that the Sesostriis tradition was very incoherent and contradictory, a proof that we have before us a popular anonymous stock of narratives, affected by the long process of transmission. We may recall here the parallel of the Alexander Romance of which there are several differing versions (cf. pp. 34-5).

The topical interest of the Sesostriis figure is further indicated by a remark of Josephus (*C. Ap.* II, §132). To Apion's insulting statement that the Jews, instead of ruling, must serve other nations, he replies that Apion has apparently quite forgotten the misery of Egyptian history, and adds: 'Sesostriis, the legendary (*μυθεύμενος*) king of Egypt, has blinded him.' As Josephus, on the one hand, recalls with pride the mighty kings David and Solomon and the Hasmoneans, and on the other reproaches the Egyptians with being nothing but slaves since the rule of the Persians (§132 f.), so Apion, himself an Egyptian, had evidently boasted of the deeds of the great world conqueror Sesostriis.¹ The designation '*μυθεύμενος*' has a contemptuous sound in the mouth of Josephus. It relegates Sesostriis to the realm of myth, i.e., to the realm of invention, of legend, and of fiction.² This agrees with the fact that already in his *Antiquities* Josephus has passed criticism upon the Herodotean (i.e., Egyptian) Sesostriis tradition, in consequence of which Sesostriis disappears from history as the great world conqueror: Josephus there identifies the campaign of Sesostriis with the relatively modest conquests of the more recent Pharaoh Shishak, and suggests that Herodotus has confused the names (*Ant.* VIII, §260).

From Josephus, *Ant.* VIII, §260, K. Sethe has drawn the conclusion that Manetho had not adopted the popular

¹ Compare the analogous case of another great Egyptian world conqueror, Rameses, in Tacitus, *Annals*, II. 60.

² Cf. *Jos. C. Ap.* I, §§105, 229, 254. Diod. I. 69. 7.

Egyptian tradition about Sesostriis, found in Herodotus; for Josephus would hardly have dared to identify Sesostriis with Shishak if this had been in opposition to Manetho, who was his authority on Egyptian history.¹ In support of this very plausible view, we may recall the parallel tendency of Berossus (cf. p. 4). His ambition was to remove from Babylonian-Assyrian history the Oriental legends which had gained a stronghold in Greek historiography. Just as Berossus has criticized the Semiramis legend (*Jos. C. Ap.* I, §142), so Manetho apparently has—silently or explicitly—opposed the popular Sesostriis legend.² In Apion, at a later stage, Graeco-Egyptian scholarship has fallen almost to the level of the legend and the pseudo-historical folk-story, in short, to the level of the Alexander Romance.³

The stories of Sesostriis developed in national opposition to the Persian rule in the same way as those of Ninus and Semiramis. With the deeds of their primeval king the humiliated Egyptians sought to overshadow the success of the Persian sovereigns, and to preserve for themselves the conviction of their own superiority. This can be inferred from the contents of the Sesostriis stories themselves, but is made very evident by an anecdote related by Herodotus (II. 110): when Darius I wished to erect his effigy in Memphis before that of Sesostriis, the priest protested against it, giving the explanation that Darius, unlike Sesostriis, had not succeeded in conquering the Scythians. Darius acknowledged this, and yielded. As Darius was in Egypt in the year 517, before the Scythian Expedition, the anecdote is unhistorical.⁴ Diodorus or his authority appears to have noticed the anachronism already, for in his *History* the priest refers no more to the Scythians (I. 58.4). If the story is, therefore, untrue, it is, all the same, well invented and 'true' in another sense. It reveals admirably the Egyptian-Persian antagonism and the anti-Persian tendency of the Sesostriis legends at that stage of development.

The victorious march of Sesostriis into Europe against

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 3, 19.

² Cf. *Jos. C. Ap.* I, §73.

³ On the fanciful character of his scholarship see the article on 'Apion' by Kohler in the *Jewish Enc.*, I., pp. 666-8, and by Cohn in *R.E.*, I., pp. 2803-6.

⁴ Cf. A. Wiedemann, *Herodots zweites Buch, mit sachlichen Erläuterungen herausgegeben*, 1890, p. 427.

the Thracians and Scythians (Herod. II. 103; Diod. 55.6) has naturally no foundation in Egyptian history; it is an invention of purely anti-Persian tendency.

Other details of the Sesostris tradition contain with more or less probability a historical nucleus,¹ but they also have adopted an anti-Persian tendency.

Sesostris begins his military career with the conquest of the whole Arabian people who had never before been subjected.² By this achievement he surpasses Cambyses, the Persian sovereign most hated by the Egyptians. Before the latter set out for the conquest of Egypt, he ensured by alliance the support of the Arabian king.³ In obvious imitation of Cambyses, the same is done by the Assyrian national hero Ninus, before he sets out on his conquests (Diod. II. 1.5 ff.). It shows what a stimulating effect the example of Cambyses has had on the formation of national legends.

Sesostris, still a youth, subjected a greater part of Libya (Diod. I. 53.6). The Libyans surrendered voluntarily to Cambyses, and sent him tribute and gifts (Herod. III. 13).

Sesostris is furthermore the first Egyptian conqueror and ruler of Ethiopia.⁴ In this part of the tradition, as Sethe has shown, the merging of Senusret I and Senusret III into Sesostris becomes most evident.⁵ But the salient point of the report on the Ethiopian campaign can only be understood if we remember the thoroughly unsuccessful attempt of Cambyses to subject Ethiopia (Herod. III. 17 ff.). The Persian king had to make an ignominious retreat to Egypt (III. 25) and, as his one success, could only claim the conquest of the Ethiopians directly adjoining Egypt (III. 97, cf. VII. 69 f.). How incomparably greater is the achievement of the Egyptian national hero! According to Diodorus (I. 55.1), Sesostris receives from the Ethiopian people ebony, gold and the tusks of elephants; according to

¹ See Sethe, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 ff.

² Diod. I. 53.5. Cf. Strabo, XVI. 769.

³ Herodotus, III. 4, 7. He explicitly states (III. 88) that the Arabs have never been subjected to the Persians, cf. Diod. II. 1.5, 48.5. According to Xenophon, *Cyrop.* I. 1.4, VII. 4.16, Cyrus, too, has subjugated the Arabs. Either Xenophon has here in mind the Syrian Arab tribes or he represents Cyrus as achieving the difficult conquest which belongs to the conventional picture of a world conqueror; cf. I. 5.2. See also Jos. C. Ap. I. §133.

⁴ Herod. II. 110; Diod. I. 55.1; Eratosthenes-Strabo, XVI. 769.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

Herodotus (III. 97), the tribes subjected by Cambyses deliver to the Persians the same gifts, and five male children in addition. The Ethiopian misfortune of Cambyses must have made a deep impression on the Egyptians, for in direct political and psychological connection with it occurred the well-known violent conflict between him and the priests of Memphis (Herod. III. 27 f.). After the slaughter of the Apis bull he was for the Egyptians an object of abhorrence and the embodiment of madness.

It is significant for the uniformity of the various hero-stories that Semiramis also, after the conquest of Egypt and a greater part of Libya, subjects Ethiopia (Diod. II. 14.4; Justin, I. 2.8). Sesostris may have been the semi-mythical model for this invention; the historical one was indubitably Cambyses, who was as much eclipsed by this achievement of the Babylonian heroine as was Darius, for instance, by the Scythian campaign of Sesostris. In the same way the expedition of Semiramis to the oracle of Ammon (Diod. II. 14.3) is obviously the counterpart of the one dispatched by Cambyses, which disappeared.¹

The connections of Semiramis with Ethiopia do not appear to have been limited to the episode recorded by Diodorus. In the Alexander Romance, Candace is called a descendant of Semiramis, and her residence, Meroe, is 'τὰ Σεμυράμειος βασιλεια' (pseudo-Callisthenes III. 18). There is no compelling reason to regard these statements, with A. Ausfeld,² as arbitrary innovations of a redactor. Babylon was not the only place in which Semiramis had a castle; there was, in fact, a large number of them.³ And why should not Semiramis, as well as Cambyses⁴ and Moses,⁵

¹ Herod. III. 26. Cf. F. Jacoby in *R.E.*, XI., p. 2043.

² *Der griechische Alexanderroman*, 1907, p. 188.

³ Cf. Diod. II. 14.2. Strabo, XVI. 737. See also Lehmann-Haupt, *op. cit.*, p. 701.

⁴ According to Diod. I. 33, Cambyses founded Meroe and named it after his mother; according to Strabo, XVII. 790, he gave the city this name after his wife or sister, who had died there. Also according to Jos. Ant. II, §249, the city, formerly called Saba, was named after Cambyses' sister.

⁵ Cf. Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.*, IX. 27, p. 433 d. As Cambyses, according to one version, named the city after his deceased mother, so Moses named it after his foster-mother, Merris, whom he buried there. It seems that behind Semiramis-Meroe-Merris stands the great goddess who was worshipped in Ethiopia and particularly in Meroe: Isis (Diod. III. 9.2; Strabo, XVII. 822). It is very significant that Artapanus states explicitly that this Merris is no less revered by the natives than is Isis (Euseb., *loc. cit.*). See also J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien (Alexander Polyhistor)*, 1874-5, pp. 154 f.

have been regarded as the founder (or name-giver) of Meroe. It is very probable that in Ethiopia itself the legend grew up that Semiramis was the ancestor of the Ethiopian queen who bore the name of Candace. In Christian times her place seems to have been taken by Makeda, the biblical Queen of Sheba,¹ whose only son Menelek is supposed to have founded the Solomonic royal house of Ethiopia. The Ethiopian romance *Kebra Nagast*² in which these events are described is quite in the tradition of the Jewish-Christian books of folk-lore. It is pre-eminently to this romance that we must ascribe the displacement of the Ethiopian-Hellenistic Semiramis legend.

After Sesostrius the conquest of Ethiopia becomes a commonplace of the hero-romance. Thus Moses, who in other respects as well has become similar to Sesostrius, defeats the Ethiopians and takes possession of their capital; the erotic element which is added here by means of the Tharbis story is characteristic of the later hero-romance (cf. pp. 97 ff.). Alexander also reaches Ethiopia and comes under the power of Queen Candace (ps.-Call. III. 18 ff.); according to the Ethiopian version, he has a love affair with her.⁴ It is Sesonchosis-Sesostrius who appears and prophesies to him in the Ethiopian cave of the gods (ps.-Call. III. 24).

The fact that Sesostrius was an outstanding exponent of Egyptian nationalism in Graeco-Roman times has apparently not prevented him from being turned into a figure of Greek romance. F. Zimmermann's recent study of Papyri. 1826 has left little room for doubt on this point.⁵ Thus Sesostrius seems to have undergone a development analogous to that of Ninus and Semiramis.

¹ According to Jos. Ant. II, §249, Saba and Meroe are only different names of the same Ethiopian city. He further narrates the visit of the queen of Egypt and Ethiopia to Solomon (Ant. VIII, §§165, 175): it is the famous visit of the Queen of Sheba (cf. Kings 10).

² The Queen of Sheba and her only Son Menelek (I) being the 'Book of the Glory of Kings' (*Kebra Nagast*) . . . translated from the Ethiopic by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge (1931).

³ Like Sesostrius (Diod. I. 94-4), Moses in Artapanus is the inventor of the Egyptian weapons and organizer of their warfare (Euseb., loc. cit., p. 432 b), and, like him (Diod. I. 54-1), divides Egypt into 36 districts.

⁴ The Alexander Book in Ethiopia, translated . . . by Sir Rhincker Museum, 85, 1936, pp. 165 ff. Cf. Rattenbury's Budge

NECTANEBUS

While Sesostrius embodied for the Egyptians the glory and grandeur of a memorable past, Nectanebus, the last Egyptian native Pharaoh, was dear to their hearts because not only their feelings of sorrow and regret, but also their national hopes for the future could be focussed on him. For evidently the belief survived for a long time among the Egyptian people that their last king would return to drive the strangers from the country. What we read in ps.-Callisthenes (I. 3.4 ff.) seems to have its nucleus in a genuine Egyptian tradition: when Nectanebus had disappeared from Egypt, the Egyptians inquired in the temple of Ptah-Hephaestus in Memphis, asking what had become of their king. They received the oracle's reply that their fugitive king would return after a certain time as a youth and subjugate the enemy.¹ This oracle was hewn on the foot of the statue of Nectanebus in Memphis.² Such hopes for the future are also voiced in the so-called *Demotic Chronicle*³ (probably dating from the third century B.C.), as E. Meyer and M. Pieper assume for good reasons.⁴

The Nectanebus tradition at our disposal is extremely scanty. The following is an attempt to enlarge our knowledge to some extent. At the same time we hope to throw new light on an Egyptian document, preserved for us by Josephus. For we believe that we shall be able to show that the Amenophis legend is in some characteristic features dependent on the Nectanebus tradition.

In the Amenophis legend, it is related that King Ameno-

¹ The antithesis 'old' and 'young' is evidently not original. It presupposes the combination of the Nectanebus legend and the Alexander legend. But then the feature that the Egyptians did not understand the import of the oracle is also a later development.

² Ausfeld, op. cit., p. 126 quotes *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Tyranni Triginta, XXII. 13 f.*: 'For at Memphis, they say, it was written on a golden column in Egyptian letters that Egypt would at last regain its freedom when the Roman fasces and the Roman bordered toga had been brought into the land. This may be found in Proculus the grammarian . . . Though it is uncertain to what this promise originally referred, the quotation proves the survival of Egyptian hopes of national liberation.'

³ Edited and translated by W. Spiegelberg, *Die sog. Demotische Chronik* (Demotische Studien, VII., 1914).

⁴ E. Meyer, *Aegyptische Dokumente aus der Perserzeit*, in *Kleine Schriften*, II., 1924, pp. 69 ff., espec. 87. M. Pieper, article 'Nektanebos' in *R.E.*, XVI., p. 2237.

phus gathered a large army and led it against the Asiatics who had invaded Egypt (Jos. C. Ap. I, §§243 ff., 274). Instead of meeting them in open battle, however, he suddenly retreated to Memphis and from there fled to Ethiopia (§246). Exactly the same was done by King Nectanebus, when the Persians under Artaxerxes III Ochus about the year 343-2 invaded Egypt (Diod. XVI. 48.6 f.): 'Nectanebus, the king of the Egyptians, was terrified by the news of the destruction of his troops, for he believed that the rest of the Persian forces would cross the river without any difficulty. . . . He returned, therefore, to Memphis with those troops he had at hand to make preparations for the siege.' Nectanebus also fled from Memphis to Ethiopia (XVI. 51.1): 'When he realized the trend of the cities (towards treason), King Nectanebus, who was still in Memphis, did not dare to face the dangers in defence of his empire; but instead he gave up his kingdom and fled to Ethiopia, taking with him most of his riches.'

Treachery and defection are also common to both reports. In the Amenophis legend, the leprous Egyptians are the traitors who call a Palestinian people into the country; in Diodorus' report, the Egyptians and the Greek mercenaries go over to the Persians.

But the conformity goes yet further. Osarsiph's brigand gangs and their Asiatic allies terrorized the population, destroyed cities and looted temples (see p. 28). And what was the situation in Egypt, when the Persians marched in? It was rife with internal disorder and violence; above all the Greek mercenaries oppressed the native population (Diod. XVI. 49.8, 50.1 ff.). Then when Artaxerxes had taken possession of the whole country, he razed the walls of the most important cities and looted the temples (XVI. 51.2 f.).

Furthermore, it is important to notice that the 'polluted' people and their allies rule for a period approximately as long as the Persians, in fact, rule after the flight of Nectanebus. The period of the Persian rule is estimated by modern scholars as ranging between ten and twelve years.¹ It is a kind of *vaticinium ex eventu* when the seers behind him for King Amenophis the prediction of the enemies

¹ See E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp.

would rule over Egypt for thirteen years (Jos. C. Ap. I, §§236, 247, 266).

I wish to emphasize the importance of a very characteristic feature, in which the Amenophis legend conforms with the Nectanebus tradition. Why did Amenophis retreat to Memphis, instead of leading his army into battle against the invaders? The reason was that he believed he was on the point of fighting against the gods (§246: . . . μέλλειν θεομαχεῖν νομίσας . . .), or, as stated by Josephus later, that he deemed it inadvisable to fight against the gods (§263: . . . οὐκ οἰόμενον δεῖν θεομαχεῖν . . .). In the context of the Amenophis legend this motive can only refer to the prophecy which prognosticated evil for his future (§236). But then it is difficult to understand why he assembled a strong army and led it against the enemy; for when the news of the invasion reached him, he at once recalled, with considerable dismay, this prophecy of evil (§243). Is not this sudden fear of fighting against the gods rather peculiar and insufficiently motivated? Something is wrong here, and this is often the case when certain components of a story, especially when in abbreviated form, have been transferred into another narrative. Here, too, the Nectanebus tradition seems to be the source of the Amenophis legend.

As with Alexander, there is both a historical tradition and a legendary one concerning his 'father' Nectanebus. According to the historical report of Diodorus, Nectanebus acts exactly as does Amenophis, but in his *motives* he differs from the latter in a very significant manner. As he, later on, flees to Ethiopia because of purely practical political considerations, so he at first retreats to Memphis without offering any resistance simply because of strategical reasons (Diod. XVI. 48.6 f.): ' . . . for he believed that the rest of the Persian forces would cross the river without any difficulty. Being afraid that the enemy would move against Memphis itself with all their forces, he deemed it advisable to provide above all for its defence.' In the Nectanebus legend, however, his behaviour, when the enemy draws near, is completely different, and so too is the motive which leads him to a pair of resistance and leave Egypt. We find this legend version in the Alexander Romance of pseudo-

Callisthenes. When it is reported to Nectanebus that numerous peoples from Asia have invaded Egypt, he intends to resist them in the manner he had always done before, namely, with the help of magic. He forms models and ships from wax in order to sink them in a basin of water and so annihilate simultaneously the hostile warriors and ships (I. 3.1): 'Then he saw that the gods of the Egyptians guided the ships of the hostile barbarians.' What we miss in the Amenophis legend we find in the Nectanebus legend, namely, the concrete situation in which the gods of the country have gone over to the opposite side, so that the Egyptian king would fight against the gods, if he did not voluntarily give up the contest. This is done by Nectanebus in the realization that he has been abandoned by the gods; he leaves Egypt in full flight (I. 3.2).

We therefore establish the fact that the Amenophis legend combines elements which we meet separately in the Nectanebus tradition, that is, partly in the History of Diodorus, and partly in the romance of pseudo-Callisthenes.

The conclusion which now forces itself upon us is the following: the Egyptian Amenophis legend presupposes a lost Egyptian story of the life of Nectanebus in which those historical and legendary elements still formed a unity; that is, the events were related in accordance with history, yet Nectanebus gave up all resistance not for political or military reasons, but because, before the decisive battle could take place, he saw an epiphany of the gods from which he gathered that the gods themselves were leading the hostile forces against him. The narrator of the Amenophis legend, who according to Josephus was Manetho, has eliminated this epiphany, perhaps because it did not fit in with the beginning of the legend,¹ or because it appeared to him as being too mythical (cf. p. 15). *Θεομαχεῖν* is the only, but very characteristic, survival which recalls the epiphany episode in the model which is followed. Henceforth, we shall call this the Nectanebus Romance.

Compared to the Nectanebus legend of pseudo-Callis-

¹ Amenophis desires to behold the gods (Jos. C. Ap. I, §232). So far as can be gathered from the report that follows, the fulfilment of this wish is denied to him. St. J. Thackeray, in his edition of *Contra Apionem*, quotes a parallel in Herodotus (II. 42).

thenes, the Nectanebus Romance must have distinguished itself by greater historicity; in comparison with Diodorus' report by a larger element of fiction. One can easily imagine a book of such ambiguous character in Egyptian literature: a book that contains neither pure history nor pure fiction, but a strange mixture of both. For, to the Egyptian, history unconsciously transforms itself at once into stories, myths and fairy tales in which the historical substance is very largely interspersed with mythical or novelistic elements, and sometimes distorted by them past recognition. Such a simple report as that of Diodorus about Nectanebus, a report limited to facts and strategical and political considerations, calls for a mental discipline of which, so far as we know, the average Egyptian was never capable. The Alexander Romance, also, bears the stamp of this Egyptian mentality which is fantastic and yet, at the same time, sober.¹

The Alexander Romance is altogether of particular importance for our problem. We must bear in mind that, only about ten years after Nectanebus' flight, Alexander seized Egypt, and that, within a short time, his life became the subject of a romance in whose formation the Egyptian element of Alexandria played a decisive part. Surely for the Egyptians of the 'χώρα' the last Pharaoh was a no less memorable and romantic figure than was the first Macedonian king for the Graeco-Egyptians of Alexandria. But the Alexander Romance seems to be even more than an excellent literary parallel. Might there not be a relationship between the Alexander Romance and the Nectanebus Romance analogous to that which, according to pseudo-Callisthenes, existed between Nectanebus and Alexander, namely, the relationship of father and son? Would not the origin of the Alexander Romance become much more intelligible, if one could assume that it was preceded by a Nectanebus Romance with which the former competed and which it strove to displace? The fundamental conception of the Alexander Romance, namely, that Alexander was the rejuvenated and returning Nectanebus, does not seem to be merely a proof of Graeco-Egyptian nationalism, but also

¹ Possibly also Artapanus and his source have been influenced by this mental attitude. With Apion it invaded Alexandrian scholarship, see pp. 15, 43.

a tribute to a popular older tradition which had already achieved literary form. It is very significant that the adventures of the exiled Nectanebus should form the overture to the Alexander Romance. There could be no clearer way of demonstrating the fact that it takes up the thread of the narrative just where the Nectanebus Romance had dropped it. Chapters 1-3 form the connecting link between the two traditions; here we find the *motif* of the epiphany of the gods, the presence of which we have assumed also in the Nectanebus Romance. The actual story of the 'Fraud of Nectanebus' can, however, hardly have appertained to the Nectanebus Romance, for if the latter was to appeal to the Egyptian people's national hopes for the future, it could have ended only with the assurance that the Egyptian Barbaros would one day return with his treasures from the Ethiopians, Kyffhäuser and drive out the hated strangers.¹ In the Alexander Romance, however, he is only the unfortunate father and predecessor of an incomparably greater son in whom the oracle of Memphis and the hope of the Egyptian people find fulfilment. In other words, the Alexander Romance had adopted the figure of Nectanebus but not without degrading and subordinating him to the personality of Alexander. In this way, the Nectanebus Romance practically became superfluous as independent subject-matter for the Graeco-Egyptians.

We must devote a few words to the so-called *Somnium Nectanebi*, a fragment now most conveniently accessible in Lavagnini's edition.² It contains the remains of a longer narrative in which Nectanebus had evidently a leading part. It had been translated from the Demotic into Greek. This is of special interest for us because it shows that Egyptian tales could reach the Greeks or Graeco-Egyptians, not only by word of mouth, but also through the agency of translations. The *Somnium Nectanebi* is of further significance because it conforms to the narrative type which we have

¹ In the Amenophis legend, the king and his son return from Ethiopia, each at the head of an army, and drive the unclean rebels and their allies out of Egypt (Jos. C. Ap. I, §§251, 266, 276 f.). What was only a hope or promise in the Nectanebus tradition is here related as an actual fact.

² *Erotophorum Fragmenta Papyracea*, ed. B. Lavagnini, Teubner, 1922, pp. 38 ff. See also U. Wilcken in *Mélanges Nicole*, 1905, pp. 579-596.

characterized above (p. 23): on the one hand, it has a typically mythical and novelistic character; on the other, it contains valuable historical elements. To the latter belongs the remarkably precise chronology,¹ as well as the localities, viz. Memphis and Sebennytus, which have actually played an important part in the history of Nectanebus (his dynasty hails from Sebennytus). With regard to the mythical-novelistic element, C. Müller has already pointed out that the *Somnium Nectanebi* agrees with pseudo-Callisthenes in the incident of the epiphany of the gods.² Curiously enough, in the *Somnium* also they appear on a ship (cf. ps.-Call. I. 3.1), and in both cases the epiphany is unfavourable to Nectanebus. Otherwise the situation in the two documents is completely different. Therefore we can state only the following with assurance: that the *motif* in itself, namely, the unfavourable epiphany of the gods on a ship, had formed part of the established Nectanebus tradition.

To revert to the Nectanebus Romance: we have voiced the opinion (p. 22) that there, too, an epiphany of the gods must have occurred. Now we may add that, as in the *Somnium*, it may have taken place in a dream, but not, as in pseudo-Callisthenes, in the course of magical proceedings. Why not in the course of magical proceedings? We have suggested that the Nectanebus of the romance went out with an army to meet the Persians, while the magician of the Alexander Romance fights his enemies with wax and magical performance. It is part of the degradation of Nectanebus in the Alexander Romance that he has lost all his martial virtues and has sunk to the level of a mere magician and astrologer. Even taking into account the Egyptians' keen interest in magic, it is extremely unlikely that the Nectanebus of the national Egyptian romance should have possessed none of the qualities of a Sesostrius. We have also assumed that the Nectanebus Romance had not strayed so far from history as the Nectanebus legend of pseudo-Callisthenes has done.

¹ See E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 78. E. Bickermann in *Mélanges Maspero*, I., 1934, pp. 78 ff.

² *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, ed. C. Müller, Didot, Paris, 1846, p. xx, adn. 2 (in Dübner's edition of Arrianus).

MOSES

It can be regarded as a general phenomenon that the psychological reaction of the ruled tends to be proportional to the challenge of the ruler. We have seen that the peoples of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt reacted to the pressure of Persian domination by creating and developing the stories of their national heroes. If, however, foreign rule, far from representing a challenge, means reconstruction and peace, the counter-challenge of the ruled, as embodied in a national novel literature, will accordingly be absent. This applies to the Palestinian Jews in the Persian period, when their spiritual and literary life appears as uncreative as their national existence does secure. Only the changes produced by Alexander's conquest and the conflicts emanating from the newly-founded Greek-Macedonian cities and empires infused fresh vitality into them.¹ In defence and counter-attack Jewish literary activity began to flourish again. The books of Daniel, Judith, and Maccabees are perhaps most typical of this nationalistic fighting spirit.

Where, as in Ptolemaic Egypt, the clash between Jews and non-Jews was less violent, Jewish fiction was largely inspired by the tendency to enhance the prestige of the Jews in the eyes of the dominant Greeks. The Letter of Aristeas is a very characteristic specimen of this sort of novel literature. Another one is that piece of fiction with which we are concerned here, namely the Moses Romance.

In the fragments of Artapanus which provide us with the oldest available version of this romance, Moses combines in a single life political, military, religious, philosophical, technical and civilizing achievements, which in the Egyptian-Hellenistic view were shared by the deities Isis, Osiris, Thot-Hermes and the national hero Sesostrius.² Not only does he surpass each one individually, but also all of them combined.

This panegyric on Moses is at the same time his apology. The Moses romance of Artapanus forms a counter-picture,

¹ Cf. E. Täubler, *Tyche*, 1926, pp. 120-4.

² Cf. p. 18. See also H. Willrich, *Judaica*, 1900, pp. 112-4. I. Heinemann, article 'Moses' in *R.E.*, XVI., p. 368. E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, 1935, pp. 20

pro-Jewish in tendency, to an anti-Jewish Egyptian account.¹ This latter is, in our view, the same as that against which Josephus inveighs in *Contra Apionem*, I, §§228 ff. We cannot here deal with the question how far Manetho actually bears responsibility for the description of events against which Josephus protests. We may indicate this much here, that most probably not he, but later Egyptian anti-Semites have identified the Jews with the 'polluted' people, and Moses with Osarsiph (§250).² Apparently, Manetho has only provided the material and his authority—both of which have been misused—to form the anti-Semitic Moses legend of the Egyptians which later is to be found in much prominence in Greek and Roman writers. That the pseudo-Manetho version existed as early as the second century B.C. appears to me to be proved by Artapanus' counter-representation.

In the Egyptian account, Moses—in time honoured fashion—is presented as an Egyptian, not, as in the case of Alexander and Homer (see pp. 40 ff.), from the motive of desiring to claim his fame, but to place shame on him and his people,—the case of Cambyses should be remembered in this connection.³ Moses was supposed to have been an Egyptian priest of Heliopolis who had been banished because of leprosy, his followers, too, suffering from leprosy and other diseases. Josephus does not refer at all to these allegations in the second book of the *Antiquities*. In Philo, however, we do find a reference to them (*Vit. Mos.* I, §39): subjected to a cruel martyrdom by hard labour, the Jews die in masses 'as of a plaguelike pestilence' (*ὡς ὑπὸ λοιμώδους φθορᾶς*). By this assertion Philo believes he elucidates what was really at the bottom of the Egyptian version, and thus removes a blot from the honour of his ancestors. In his

¹ Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 161, has already recognized that Artapanus' account is directed against certain views and inventions of Egyptians and Greeks. In our opinion, it can be shown that his opposition is primarily directed against Manetho or pseudo-Manetho.

² See Heinemann's excellent article 'Antisemitism' in *R.E.*, Suppl. V., especially pp. 26 ff.

³ Cambyses is represented by the Egyptians as being the son of a concubine of Egyptian origin (Herod. III. 2). Though half Egyptian, he nevertheless attacks the cults and temples of Egypt! The motive with which Herodotus accounts for the Egyptian version is just as erroneous as that of Josephus with regard to Moses (*C. Ap.* I, §279).

presentation of the affair, the Jews fall ill and die, because their health is undermined by compulsory labour, while the Egyptian account asserts, on the contrary, that they had been condemned to forced labour in the quarries, because they suffered from leprosy.¹ As for Artapanus, he appears to retaliate against the Egyptian calumny by a like method. He relates that King Chenephres, the persecutor of Moses and the Hebrews, had been the first to be stricken by and to die of elephantiasis—naturally as a punishment for some disciplinary measure directed against the Jews (Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* IX. 27, p. 434 b). The so-called *elephantiasis Graecorum* is only another designation for leprosy.

The labour in the quarries is also mentioned by Artapanus. But, in his account, it is a portion of the army under the command of Moses which the jealous king orders to go to the quarries, intending to deprive his victorious general, who has defeated the Ethiopians, of troops (p. 433 a). It is remarkable that, according to Artapanus, Moses amongst other things has also invented machines 'for laying stones' (p. 432 a).

In the Egyptian source, it is further stated that the lepers rose against King Amenophis and chose Moses as their leader. But Moses gave them a law not to worship any gods, and not to spare any of the animals revered in Egypt, but on the contrary, to slaughter all and eat them (*Jos. C. Ap.* I, §239). In conjunction with the Solymites, whom he had ordered to be fetched from Palestine, the 'polluted' people then terrorized Egypt in the most horrible manner; not only did they burn down cities and villages, but also looted temples, and destroyed the statues of gods, that is those which had not been hidden by order of Amenophis (§244), they even forced priests and prophets to slaughter the sacred animals (those which the fugitive Amenophis had not carried off to Ethiopia, §246). These they then roasted on the wood of the statues, the priests and prophets themselves being driven out naked (§§248-9). It is evident that, according to the Egyptian version, the leader of these

¹ Cf. *Jos. C. Ap.* I, §§233 ff. It is obviously in defence and counter-attack against the anti-Semitic Moses legend (cf. *Jos. C. Ap.* I, §§288 ff., 304 ff.; *Tac. Hist.* V. 3) that Philo sets forth an explanation of why Moses led the Hebrews into the desert and promulgated there his laws (*De Decalogo*, §§2-13).

robber gangs, Moses, was a monster, compared with whom Cambyzes, the destroyer of Egyptian temples and slayer of the Apis bull,¹ was quite a harmless person.

The account of Artapanus is diametrically opposed to this representation, as is invariably the case when two reports are in the relationship of thesis and antithesis. To Artapanus, Moses is not the arch-traitor and rebel leader, before whom the king must flee into exile to Ethiopia, but the untiring, unselfish and ungratefully treated paladin of the throne, who is especially concerned with the stabilization of the monarchy (p. 432 b c): 'All these things he did for the sake of achieving stability for Chenephres' monarchy. For previously the turbulent multitudes now expelled and now set up kings, . . . Even when later he is forced to flee because of the murderous attempt of the king, he remains loyal out of consideration for his countrymen left behind in Egypt: he restrains the Arab prince Raguel, his father-in-law, from carrying out his intention to invade Egypt in order to place Moses and his wife on the throne. Raguel contents himself with ordering his Arabs to undertake inroads into Egypt (p. 434 a b). Therefore he, and not Moses, bears the responsibility for the lootings related by Egyptian tradition! Only by command of the divine voice is Moses later prepared to undertake a campaign against Egypt (p. 434 c).

Artapanus looks upon Moses as the greatest benefactor of Egypt, the organizer of its life in all departments. To him he is not a destroyer, but a founder of cities. He does not oppress the Egyptians and their priests; he wins the love of the people and religious reverence of the priests, who address him as 'Hermes' (p. 432 c). It is Moses who endows the priests with special tracts of land, while in the Egyptian version it is said that he drove them out naked.

But above all Moses is neither an incendiary of temples, nor a slaughterer of sacred animals. 'The complete opposite is true!' we read between the lines of Artapanus' account. We read there the astounding statement that he, who later was the founder of the Jewish religion, is the father of the whole Egyptian ritualistic organization. Moses not only carries out the same work as Sesostris, namely, the division

¹ See p. 17. Cp. also E. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, p. 36.

of Egypt into thirty-six districts (Diod. I. 54.3), but he also assigns a god to each district (p. 432 b), thereby accomplishing a task which is usually ascribed to the gods Osiris (Diod. I. 15.3f.) and Hermes (Diod. I. 16.1) and to King Menas (Diod. I. 45.1). The foundation of the much-derided animal cults is claimed for Moses:¹ cats, dogs, ibises and the Apis bull are specifically mentioned (p. 432 b, d, 433 b). These assertions of an Egyptian Jew contain the strongest imaginable protest against the allegation that Moses forbade his followers by law to worship the gods, and made the slaughter of the sacred animals a duty.

While in Artapanus' account Moses invents for the Egyptians the sacred hieroglyphics and the philosophy, and gives them their gods and their cults of animals, Philo, on the other hand, relates in *Vit. Mos.* I, §23, that Moses was instructed by the Egyptians in the philosophy of symbols 'as displayed in the so-called holy inscriptions and in the regard paid to animals, to which they even pay divine honours.' Therefore Moses, according to Philo, receives from Egyptian scholars—and not the other way about—the knowledge of the Egyptian secret philosophy, of the hieroglyphics and of the symbolically-regarded deified animals. Is this not a revision of the older and more primitive version of Artapanus?² This must have enjoyed great popularity, since Philo, who usually speaks very disparagingly of the Egyptian animal worship,³ would hardly have seen fit to honour the 'sacred' animal symbols by introducing them as elements in Moses' education. To dispose of Artapanus' version, in the manner of driving out the devil by Beelzebub, he replaces the animal deities, alleged inventions of Moses, by the Egyptian animal symbols. This is the second time that we can observe how Philo adopts popular unbiblical versions, yet silently revises them (cf. pp. 27-8).

There is yet another point of contact between Philo and Artapanus. Both of these, and also Josephus and the Mid-

¹ According to Justin, XXXVI. 2.13, Moses, at the Exodus, carried off the sacred utensils of the Egyptians. At the end of chap. 2, we read that the rites of the Jews were of Egyptian origin. According to Artapanus, on the contrary, the Egyptian cults are of Jewish—or more precisely—of Mosaic origin.

² Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 173, has failed to notice that on this point Philo has revised an account à la Artapanus.

³ Compare, however, Philo, *De Decalogo*, §77.

rash, agree that the marriage of the Egyptian princess, the king's only daughter, was childless. In the following point Philo and Artapanus conform even more closely. For while, according to Josephus (*Ant.* II, §232), the princess *adopts* the three year old boy, without making a secret of his origin, according to the other two, she *passes him off as her own child*.¹ Here, Artapanus' account is indubitably much abridged: *ταύτην δὲ στέραν ὑπάρχουσαν ὑποβαλέσθαι τινὸς τῶν Ἰουδαίων παιδίον . . .* (p. 432a). We are not even informed of the circumstances under which the little Moses came into the hands of the Egyptian princess. And so we are also left in doubt as to how she managed to pass off the child as her own. It is only reasonable to assume that she simulated pregnancy,² and according to Philo, that is what the king's daughter actually did (*Vit. Mos.* I, §19): ' . . . the princess . . . took him for her son, having at an earlier time artificially enlarged the figure of her womb to make him pass as her real and not a supposititious (*ὑποβολιμαῖος*) child.' Did Philo take over the pretence of pregnancy from Artapanus or a similar authority, or did he merely infer it therefrom? The former appears more probable to us when we remember, on the one hand, that Artapanus' account has reached us only in an abridged form, and on the other, that Philo shows very little imagination or inclination to develop such narrative details.³

ALEXANDER

Apart from some details, the Alexander Romance of pseudo-Callisthenes is without any value as a source for the history of Alexander the Great. But it would be unwise for that reason to lay it aside with contempt, as modern scholars have done. Though pseudo-Callisthenes may have considered himself a historian, it is the privilege of posterity, sometimes at least, to know better what men of the past

¹ This detail has already been very briefly mentioned by Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

² Cf. Herod. V. 41, where a queen, who hitherto had been childless, was suspected of similar trickery.

³ It is remarkable that Philo's description of the life of Joseph attributes to him the introduction into Egyptian society of elegant table manners, and in particular, of the Hebrew order of precedence (*De Jos.* §§202-6). This sounds rather like Artapanus or a similar source.

really were; and pseudo-Callisthenes should be regarded as the narrator and formulator of a historical *myth*, the Alexander myth, which is at the same time the myth of Alexandria. That he used historical sources is no argument against this, for in the era of Alexandrian scholarship even myths were built upon a foundation of scholarship, as the 'Myth of the Twentieth Century' is based upon an interpretation of anthropology and history. It is from the dregs and lower strata of historiography that the Alexander Romance has drawn its 'erudition.'¹

Is the Alexander Romance a product of degenerate Hellenistic historiography? Such is the opinion of those who have adopted E. Schwartz's theory about the origin of the Greek Romance.² This, however, is too mechanical an explanation of the actual process of development. One might even venture to assert that no Alexander Romance would ever have developed from the rhetorical and theatrical products of Hellenistic historiography, however romantic they might be. As we have said, the Alexander Romance has drawn upon Hellenistic historiography, but it is not the product of its degeneracy. It belongs rather to a *ἑτέρον γένος* not only in the classification of literature, but also in virtue of its social and psychological character. In its essential features, it has more in common with a Hellenistic-Oriental book of folk-lore than with a Greek historical work. It belongs to the literature of Hellenistic-Oriental folk-lore, and has its moral and social roots in the Graeco-Egyptian population of Alexandria.³ It does not represent

¹ The 'learned' character of the Alexander Romance has been pointed out by Th. Nöldeke in his study *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans* (=Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Kl., XXXVIII, Wien, 1890). Since this work appeared, however, the dependence of the Alexander Romance on historical sources has been stressed in a one-sided manner by Kroll, Ausfeld and others, and the connexion between the romance and the Hellenistic-Oriental popular literature has been too readily overlooked. Lavagnini is a notable exception; he has strongly emphasized the popular character and Graeco-Egyptian origin of the Alexander Romance (*op. cit.*, pp. 64 ff., 70 f.). See also E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 1914, pp. 197 ff.

² E. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-8. J. Ludvíkovský, *Recký román Dobrodružný*, Prague, 1925, p. 149 (in the summary written in French).

³ When we here, and elsewhere, speak of 'Graeco-Egyptians' we do not refer exclusively to a population sprung from mixed marriages. This class became numerous only in the time of the later Ptolemies and of the Roman Empire (cf. Jos. C. Ap. II, §§69 f.). Generally, and sometimes exclusively, the reference is to Hellenized Egyptians.

a type of historiography which has by an intrinsic process degenerated to the level of folk-lore; instead it is a book of folk-lore which, without losing its peculiar character, has risen to the lower strata of historiography.

Although the work of pseudo-Callisthenes is at once history, myth and romance, we have become used to calling it the Alexander Romance. This designation is one-sided, and therefore easily misleading. For the ancient and modern reader of a romance (in the narrower sense of the word) would know that fiction and not fact is put before him. But the Alexander Romance, in common with history and myth, claims to recount actual events. And one may be sure that the common people, to whom it belonged spiritually and socially, believed in the truth of the account as implicitly as a child believes a fairy-tale. The naïve claim of pseudo-Callisthenes to authoritativeness, combined with his complete indifference to the facts of time and space, turn the Alexander Romance into a historical myth; it is a romance in so far as it is a work for the entertainment of the reader, written in prose.

We have established two essential characteristics of the myth: it is authoritative and objectively untrue. It is, therefore, fairly easy to find evidence of a great number of errors and fancies in pseudo-Callisthenes, and to censure the monstrosity of his historical outlook; it is more difficult to work out his underlying purpose. It may be in the interests of truth to expose the falsehood of myths which assume the garb of historiography or science; but in the interests of the *whole* truth, there is the further task of comprehending and appreciating such neo-mythical products as the expression of a distinctive mental climate and of a distinctive politico-national current.

Thus the Alexander Romance belongs spiritually and socially to the common people who cannot clearly and consciously differentiate between truth (*ἀλήθεια*), lies (*ψεῦδος*) and literary fiction (*πλάσμα*) and therefore willingly accept the myth, especially the written myth, above all when this myth appeals to their wishes and ideals, as members of a particular social group. In the Alexander Romance, truth and fiction are inextricably interwoven.

The categories *ψεῦδος* and *πλάσμα* cannot be applied at all to the mass of untrue and fantastic statements. To apply them would be unjust to the anonymous author and his readers, because the standards and categories of the historian are not applicable to their intellectual capacities.

The Alexander Romance is also devoid of the sense of time and chronology. The same applies to geographical matters. Like a child, pseudo-Callisthenes disposes recklessly and grandly of time and space: it is the mythical mentality as we find it in primitive peoples.

The Alexander Romance is the work of an unknown author. The name Callisthenes was attributed to him only later; it is, therefore, not a literary pseudonym of his own choice assumed like those of other ancient novelists as a means of acquiring popularity or conforming to fashion. The book was originally entitled simply *The Life of Alexander*. Even to-day the name of the author plays no appreciable part in literature destined for the ordinary man. He reads detective-stories or novels for their contents, without asking whether they have been published anonymously, under a pseudonym, or under the proper name of the author.

As to-day's production of love-stories and detective-stories is adapted to the taste and interest of the masses, it is in itself a production *en masse*. These mass creations rapidly become old-fashioned, and disappear from the scene in a very short time. This tendency must have made itself felt in the later Roman period, even though on a smaller scale than in our own time. Then, too, novels became mere waste paper and fell into oblivion after a relatively short life. On the other hand, it is characteristic of the ancient narrative production that, throughout antiquity, it adhered tenaciously to traditional subjects. Between the Oriental stories of Ninus and Semiramis and the Hellenistic Ninus Romance there is a continuous line of development, whose intermediate stages are unfortunately no longer known to us. The lives of Sesostris, Moses, Joseph and—last but not least—of Alexander were reproduced again and again throughout the centuries. In this lasting topical interest and popularity of national heroic figures lies the ultimate

reason why their tradition is so inconsistent and so full of interpolations. For the Alexander Romance is by no means unique in this respect. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs offer a similarly chaotic picture, and we have already mentioned that in Diodorus' time the stories of Sesostris were current in different versions (see p. 14).

In the more recent attempts to elucidate the origins and development of the Greek Romance, more and more attention has rightly been paid to the Alexander Romance. Some scholars even look upon it as the starting-point of a line of development which runs from it to Heliodorus, by way of the Ninus Romance and Charito (e.g., J. Ludvíkovský and R. M. Rattenbury). The solidity of this very tempting construction depends ultimately on the question when the Alexander Romance originated—was it in its original form written about 300 B.C. or 300 A.D. (i.e., about the time of Heliodorus, the last link in that chain)? No less a scholar than W. Kroll supports the later date,¹ while most scholars uphold a more or less early pre-Christian origin of the Alexander Romance (e.g. A. Ausfeld, U. Wilcken, B. Lavagnini and the two writers already mentioned). One more voice will be added to this many-voiced choir in the following pages.

The best key to the chronology of an entirely undated work is always its conscious or unconscious tendency and attitude. We shall, therefore, make a closer study of the tendency of the Alexander Romance, since the tendentious character of the national hero-romances forms the fundamental subject of this chapter.

Ausfeld, to whom research on the Alexander Romance is deeply indebted, has committed the error of attributing a Graeco-Macedonian tendency to the book.² Kroll has correctly diagnosed its Egyptian tendency without, however, defining more closely which species of Egyptian patriotism comes to light here, and under what conditions it became possible. Above all, he has treated the importance of the tendency as a bagatelle: 'So far as one can speak of a ten-

¹ R.E. X., p. 1719. *Historia Alexandri Magni (Pseudo-Callisthenes)*, ed. Kroll, I., 1926, p. xv. See also E. Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
² *Op. cit.*, pp. 234 f.

dency in such a trivial work (*Machwerk*), it is Egyptian.¹ It is altogether incomprehensible why a *Machwerk*, that is a work without artistic or scholarly value, should be less tendentious than works of art and science, or why the tendency which prompted it should be taken less seriously. If lack of tendency is at all possible in the literary sphere, then it is only in a truly artistic or scientific masterpiece. On the other hand, it is of primary importance to recognize and to appreciate the tendency of such books as the Alexander Romance, the Letter of Aristeas, the Third Book of Maccabees and the Moses romance of Artapanus, which are all rather valueless from the literary point of view. The sometimes more, sometimes less conscious tendency forms one, if not frequently *the* motive of such literature. There are obviously differences of degree in the consciousness and force of the tendency: so pseudo-Callisthenes presents his tendency more naïvely than Artapanus, but the 'tendency', in the widest sense of the word, was a decisive factor in the writing of both stories.

It would be equally erroneous to imagine that 'tendency' is limited to *Machwerke*. Indubitably in them it strikes us as being more ostentatious and distorting, but when we consider the entire literature, we come to the surprising conclusion that tendentiousness, in its most varied shades, is characteristic of almost all Oriental fiction of the Hellenistic era. The line from pseudo-Callisthenes to Heliodorus marks the development of the novel from the Graeco-Oriental underworld to the universal Greek world of culture. This path led from national or religious tendentiousness to a conventionalized lack of tendency, or in other words, the particular national tendency was gradually replaced by a general individualistic moral attitude.

Unlike the tendency of other hero-romances, as for example the national-Jewish tendency of the Moses romance, that of the Alexander Romance is more parochial. It is neither exclusively Graeco-Macedonian, nor exclusively Egyptian. It is a cross of both national currents; here the characteristic expression of the city in which the romance originated and which it glorifies—Alexandria.

¹ R.E., X., p. 1718.

Its tendency and general outlook stamp the Alexander Romance as a Graeco-Egyptian document, the largest and most important that has been preserved to us from that lower literary plane.

The Janus-head of the Alexander Romance displays on the one side Greek, on the other Egyptian features. It represents the lower classes of Alexandria in which Greek and Egyptian elements intermingled; the Egyptian element retaining a strong predominance by a steady influx from the country.¹

To pseudo-Callisthenes, the intellectual and military superiority of the Greeks is unquestionable. He has a childlike and unreserved admiration for Greek culture. And above all, it is the victories and conquests of Macedonians and Greeks which he glorifies, even if in his representation Alexander himself was half-Egyptian. The glorification of those victories and conquests naturally implies acceptance of the Ptolemaic rule and the existing order. Pseudo-Callisthenes has no objection to the suppression and exploitation of the 'χώρα', as it benefits Alexandria, 'the capital of the world' (I. 34.9). He even justifies expressly the slavery enforced on the Egyptians through the authoritative mouth of Alexander, the son of Nectanebus (I. 34.8): it must be ascribed to the providence and justice of the gods that the Egyptians who are in possession of the fertile Nile Valley should in exchange have to serve foreign conquerors. Thus the proletarian or lower middle-class Graeco-Egyptian of Alexandria cynically adopts the point of view of the Graeco-Macedonian ruling class. The economic and financial exploitation of the 'χώρα' explains alike the hatred of the Egyptians towards Alexandria.²

¹ According to the Alexander Romance, the population of the newly-founded city consisted of Egyptians whom Alexander transplanted there from the neighbouring villages (I. 31.8): καὶ κελεύει τοῖς κατοικοῦσι κοινά μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν μιλίων τῆς πόλεως ἔξω, χώραν αὐτοῖς χαρισάμενος, προσαγορεύσας αὐτοὺς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς. It is significant for the Egypto-Alexandrian aspect of the romance that the Egyptians of Alexandria claim the name 'Alexandrians' and trace their status as Alexandrians back to Alexander, the founder and, later, the deity of the city. Compare, however, with this claim Jos. C. Ap. II, §§71 f.; Bell. II, §§487 f. V. Ehrenberg rightly emphasizes that Alexandria was never a purely Greek city (*Alexander und Ägypten*, 1926, p. 27). Cf. Philo, *In Flaccum*, §§17, 29, 43. See M. Rostovtzeff, *The History of the Hellenistic World*, I, 1928, p. 115. W. B. E. Barton, *Aegypten und die Hellenen*, 1922, pp. 40.

and the support of the lower classes of Alexandria for the existing system of oppression.

We must also bear in mind that the economic exploitation of the Egyptian population was accompanied by a systematic moral degradation. When condemned to corporal punishment, the Egyptians and the Alexandrians were not scourged with the same kind of instruments nor by the same class of executioners (Philo, *In Flaccum*, §§78 ff.). The procedure, followed on these occasions, was obviously devised to humiliate the 'natives' and to erect a sort of caste-barrier between them and the privileged city-population, which included not only the citizens in the stricter sense but also privileged individuals and bodies, such as the Jews. How well this device worked can be best appreciated from Philo's indignation at Flaccus' temerity in humiliating the Jewish senators by having them scourged in the manner prescribed for the Egyptians (*loc. cit.*, §80). It is easy to imagine that the Egyptians who lived in Alexandria were not less anxious than the Jews to raise their political and moral status and to share the privileges of the Greeks and Macedonians. They were naturally driven to divorce their destinies from those of the despised mass of the Egyptian people.

On the other hand, this type of 'Alexandrian' was very conscious of his Egyptian origin. The feeling of inferiority which he experienced in relation to the dominant minority found its compensation in increased emphasis on the ancient culture of Egypt. His pride was confirmed by the fact that many Greeks themselves fervently admired the customs and achievements of the Egyptians.¹

This Egyptian self-assertion, as well as the desire for equality with the Greeks, is possibly revealed at the very beginning of the *Alexander Romance* (I. 2.3). There the Egyptian Nectanebus describes the invading Eastern peoples as 'barbarians'. It is evident that the Egyptians are implicitly classed as equals of the Greeks. The sentence in question is, however, missing in the A-version of the romance.

It is further significant that, according to pseudo-Callis-

¹ Among the admirers of Egypt in early Hellenistic times one must count above all Hecataeus of Abdera.

thenes, the Greeks and Macedonians, as late as Philip's time, had to pay tribute to the Persians.¹ Alexander was the one who delivered them, as well as the Egyptians, from the Persian yoke. Again the Greeks and Macedonians, on the one hand, and the Egyptians, on the other, are shown as equals.

More significant than this is the connection of Alexander with the two figures who at that time had the greatest topical interest for the Egyptians—with Sesostris, the great world conqueror, and with Nectanebus, the last Egyptian king. Here an Egyptian tendency comes to light; it is *Graeco-Egyptian* in so far as Alexander was definitely ranked above the two Egyptian national heroes. But in order to understand the various tendencies it is necessary to consider briefly the political and psychological position of the Egyptians under Alexander and the Ptolemies.

Not only Egypt but also the hearts of the Egyptians became Alexander's when, in the year 332 B.C., he put an end to the hated Persian rule which only about ten years before had been restored, to the accompaniment of bloodshed, devastation and religious persecution. He treated the Egyptians with a kindness and consideration which might have been due to a conscious desire to provoke a contrast between himself and Artaxerxes III Ochus.² Here in Egypt he put into practice for the first time the policy which is inseparably connected with his name, namely, to reconcile Greeks and Orientals, and place them more or less on a footing of equality instead of forcing the latter, according to the well-known warning of Aristotle, to be subjects of a Graeco-Macedonian ruling class. An honourable and privileged position was intended for Egypt in the empire of Alexander. It practically ceased to be a satrapy.³ Doloaspis, whom Alexander appointed civil governor of the Nile Valley, was an Egyptian. This was a subtle, calculated move, for his office was as representative as it was powerless. It is very probable that at this time the hope sprang up among

¹ I. 23, 25; III. 1. In the A-version of I. 25 the sentence in question is missing, cf. Kroll's edition, p. 25.

² See Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff. U. Wilcken, *Alexander der Grosse*, 1931, pp. 103 ff.

³ See Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff.

the Egyptian people that under the new Pharaoh, Alexander, a new and happier era might be dawning upon Egypt. In those days he may have been acclaimed as the 'new Sesostris'. And probably it was then also that the legend originated about his being in reality the son of Nectanebus.¹ But the hopes of the Egyptians were soon doomed to bitter disappointment. It is hardly possible to say whether already during Alexander's lifetime they felt disappointed by the régime of Cleomenes of Naucratis who had soon worked himself up from the position of an administrator of taxes to the power of a satrap (it is obvious that Alexander's political reorganization of Egypt was not of long duration). But as long as Alexander lived, at least the face of that policy of reconciliation which was serious and sacred to him was saved. Besides, Cleomenes extorted sums of money without distinction from Greeks and Egyptians alike, so that the latter could find comfort in an equality of sufferings. Only the first Ptolemy—and even he not immediately—effected a radical change of system in the treatment of the 'χώρα': Alexander's ideal and policy of reconciliation and amalgamation were completely abandoned, the undisguised rulership of Macedonians and Greeks over the 'country' was established, and the residence moved from Memphis, the ancient royal city of Egypt, to Alexandria.² It was only natural that this change of system was accompanied by a violent reaction of public opinion. From now on a wide gulf of hatred and contempt separated Greeks and Egyptians. The illusions of the Egyptians had been finally dispelled, and their hatred of the Greeks surpassed perhaps even that which they had once felt for the Persians. We do not know how they reacted to the memory of Alexander, whether they forgot him, or continued to keep him personally in kind remembrance. But we do know that in Graeco-Roman times *Sesostris* was the representative Egyptian national hero whose deeds never ceased to be glorified in Egypt (see pp. 13 ff.), and, as the Demotic Chronicle indicates, the return of Nectanebus was expected even under the Ptolemies. Only in one class of people in Hellenistic Egypt did the

¹ See Wilcken, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

² See E. Kornemann, *Die Satrapenpolitik des ersten Lagiden*, in *Raccolta di scritti in onore di G. Lumbroso*, 1925, pp. 235–245.

ideals and ideas of Alexander survive, because there they conformed to a social and racial reality, namely, in the Graeco-Egyptian populace of Alexandria whose ideological and psychological representative for us is the Alexander Romance. It is not chance that this has not originated in any city of Alexander's former empire except Alexandria where Alexander, as nowhere else, remained a living presence, not only as the god of the city but above all as an effective historical power. He was always alive and present in the thoughts of the lower classes of Alexandria, that is, in the thoughts of the Graeco-Egyptians. Nor, therefore, is it chance that they, and not Greeks or Macedonians, honoured his memory in the Alexander myth or Alexander Romance. These Alexandrians were the heirs of Alexander's ideal of reconciliation and amalgamation between the Orient and Greece, though, of course, only so far as they themselves were concerned (they dissociated themselves as resolutely from the Egyptians of the 'χώρα' as they tried to ingratiate themselves with the privileged Macedonians and Olympians). For them Alexander, the son of Nectanebus and Olympias, became a symbolical figure, the prototype of amalgamation between Greeks and Egyptians and the embodiment of the future Alexandrian.

It now remains to show in detail how, in the romance of pseudo-Callisthenes, Alexander is connected with the two Egyptian national heroes, Sesostris and Nectanebus.

When Alexander marched into Egypt, according to pseudo-Callisthenes (I. 34.2), the prophets in all the towns went to meet him with the effigies of the gods and acclaimed him as 'the new world ruler Sesonchosis'. And when he returned to Egypt on his bier, the inhabitants of Memphis again received him as 'Σεσόγχωσιν κοσμοκράτορα ἡμίθεον' (III. 34.4). We have already mentioned (p. 18) that Sesonchosis, 'the world ruler, king and companion of the gods', appeared to him in the Ethiopian cave of the gods. Here he acknowledges Alexander as being the more fortunate, because his name has become immortal. He prophesies to him the world fame of Alexandria where his tomb would be, and where he would be worshipped as a god (III. 24).

Sesonchosis equally confirms and legitimizes the Ptole-

maic-Alexandrian god Sarapis.¹ In other sources (i.e. the false Sothis Book, Hieronymus), the latter has even been proclaimed his father.²

In the Alexander Romance, Alexander is not only regarded as 'νέος Σεσόγχασις,' but also as *Nectanebus redivivus*. He fulfils an oracle with which, like other romances,³ the narrative had begun (I. 3.5, cf. I. 34.3 ff.): Nectanebus, fugitive from his country, would return to Egypt as a youth and subjugate the enemy (see p. 19). An Egyptian oracle, probably genuine in its nucleus (it need not have been carved on the statue of Nectanebus; it may have been in apocryphal circulation), has here been applied to Alexander.

Reference has already been made to the great, one may almost say the supreme, significance of the story of Nectanebus' fraud in the Alexander Romance (see pp. 23 f., 40 f.). This story narrates how Nectanebus, the last native king of Egypt, became a fugitive from his land, and fled to Macedonia. Here, disguised as the god Ammon, he cohabited with Olympias, Philip's wife, and begot Alexander.⁴ This story contains, first, certain specifically Egyptian narrative elements, such as the use of magic of every description. In no other part of the Alexander Romance do such elements occur, or, at all events, with such definiteness or vivid characteristics. Secondly, as previously stated, the Graeco-Egyptian tendency of the whole romance is most clearly seen in the initial events: Alexander, the mighty world-conqueror, the founder of Alexandria, who became its deity, was a Graeco-Egyptian.⁵ We shall not go very far astray if we regard this story of Nectanebus' fraud as the seed from which the Alexander Romance developed.⁶

¹ Ps.-Callisth. I. 33.6; III. 24 (cf. Kroll's edition, p. 123).

² See Sethe, *op. cit.*, p. 14. Roeder in *R.E.*, 2nd series, I, p. 2402.

³ Cf. Xen. Eph. I. 6. As the Egyptians in the Alexander Romance fail to understand the oracle, so do the two fathers in Xen. Eph. (I. 7.1). An oracle plays a great part also in the story of Cupid and Psyche, which is a miniature romance (Apul. *Met.* IV. 32 f.).

⁴ See O. Weinreich, *Der Trug des Nektanebos* (1911).

⁵ We can safely regard the Epirot Olympias as a Macedonian or Greek, since the average Alexandrian would certainly have done so. Cp. also Jos. *Ant.* XI, §337.

⁶ It is remarkable that on the Egyptian side an analogous story was invented in regard to the origin of Homer. In Heliodorus (III. 14) a certain Egyptian, Calasiris, states that in reality Homer was of Egyptian descent and that he came from Thebes. His father was Hermes, who cohabited with the wife of one of his prophets while she was sleeping ritually in the temple. It is to be assumed that in

of the birth-legend of Alexander, the god Ammon, with whom Nectanebus, as Pharaoh, was identified, consorted with Olympias. On the other hand, in the rationalized Alexandrian version, Nectanebus appears merely disguised in the garb of Ammon (cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, 1906, p. 141). On the Jewish side, Moses, i.e., the Jewish Homer, was not depicted as the son of Hermes-Thot but was identified with him (see p. 29). The question arises whether, just as there existed a Judaeo-Egyptian 'Moses Romance', there may have existed a Graeco-Egyptian 'Homer Romance'. Pliny in his *Natural History* (XXX. 6) mentions that Apion who was a Hellenized Egyptian claimed to have summoned Homer's shade by means of a magic herb for the purpose of inquiring about his native country and parents; but he adds that Apion did not reveal Homer's answer. Considering the celebrity of Apion, we may hazard the conjecture that the story related by Heliodorus originated in connection with this feat of his: it may be the apocryphal answer for which the world was still waiting. Compare also the modern attempt to claim Jesus for the Aryans.

CHAPTER II

BIBLICAL LEGEND IN JEWISH-HELLENISTIC LITERATURE WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TREATMENT OF THE POTIPHAR
STORY IN THE TESTAMENT OF JOSEPH

IN this chapter we consider a number of Jewish apocryphal tales the formation of which is comprehensible only when one compares them with other products of Hellenistic-Oriental fiction. They are to be found in the *Testament of Joseph* (T.J.), which itself forms part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (TT.). This document, whose importance for the religious and ethical development of later Judaism and for the origins of Christianity cannot be assessed too highly, has naturally been used chiefly for the study of the history of religion.¹ The TT., however, have their basis in the life-stories of the individual patriarchs, and therefore contain, not merely doctrines, but also, to a great extent, fiction, real Haggadah. This Haggadic element has been almost entirely neglected, so that literary-historical research has here still an open field before it. It is, of course, clear that the yield for the history of religion and ethics from such studies will also be considerable: in the actions and attitudes of characters in fiction the human and religious outlook of an epoch or community is much more directly and truly revealed than in doctrines and commandments. In other words, a tale can form an excellent mirror of explicitly pronounced dogmatic teaching; at any rate it embodies in a fixed yet living form the image of a people or a society.

If one examines the TT. from the standpoint whether, and if so to what extent, subjects of erotic interest are to be found—these form the subject-matter *par excellence* of

¹ A great deal of pioneer research work has been done on the text of the *Testaments*. As the manuscripts are in very bad condition and full of interpolations, every modern student of this literary document is deeply indebted to the edition and translation of R. H. Charles.

ancient novels and short stories—it is immediately apparent that morality centering around questions of sex-life is an ever-recurring theme: it is one of the most burning anxieties of the pleading and admonishing patriarchs, who do not recoil even from bitter self-accusation. Chastity is demanded incessantly, prostitution, adultery, etc. are branded as terrible sins, and the danger which threatens man from the beauty and seductiveness of woman is painted in the most lurid colours. Similar moral exhortations are to be found in the Proverbs and in the poem of Jesus ben Sirach.¹ We may assume that the appearance of these problems and the grave manner in which they are treated is due to the decisive fact that under the Diadochi the new Hellenistic city culture had entered the near East and with it Palestine. In its wake had come courtesanship and a certain general tendency to eroticism in the manner of living. It is precisely in the severity and violence of the polemic against eroticism and courtesanship that the strength of these social phenomena can be perceived. Naturally we cannot here undertake to investigate how Judaism and, later on, Christianity settled these problems. It is enough to point out that, while the poet of the Proverbs and, after him, Jesus ben Sirach (about 200 B.C.), preach against the folly and sin of sensual pleasure, still being sure of their own immunity, in the TT. we find that the pious believer feels his soul torn asunder. In the confessions and self-accusations of the repentant sinners of yester-year we hear the voice of a society which considers itself most seriously threatened by Eros: already it is beginning to regard love as the mightiest weapon of sin wielded by the evil spirit Beliar. This heralds, though as yet from a great distance, the painful conflict of the human spirit in late antiquity, when men and women, terrorized by the demon of sensuality, took refuge in penitence, asceticism and monastic life.

It is a fact which may seem paradoxical, but it has a psychological basis, that anti-erotic polemics usually go hand in hand with a strong and intense interest in erotic incidents and narratives. This interest is, in fact, none the

¹ Very characteristic are, for instance, Proverbs vi. 24 ff., vii. 1 ff.; Sirach ix. 3 ff.

weaker because of its negative attitude. Nothing can illustrate this better than the luxurious growth of a kind of ascetic eroticism in the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, or in the legends of the saints and monks. And so we see also in the TT. a combination of anti-erotic preaching with a lively interest in erotic events. However, it is apparent that in the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and in the *Mönchsbelletristik*¹ the erotic element of fiction is incomparably more strongly developed than in the TT. These represent a very much earlier stage, not only in the development of the spiritual and religious conflict, but also in the process of Hellenization. This latter process is of particular importance in two ways for Jewish and Christian literature; in the adoption of the Hellenistic narrative technique and in the assimilation of the material which had accumulated in Hellenistic fiction. In the TT. which, originating somewhere about the end of the second century B.C., belong to a relatively early period, there is hardly a trace of Hellenistic narrative technique. And the erotic subject-matter is so overlaid with moral exhortation that it can develop only in a very inadequate manner.² There is, however, one section which forms a surprising exception. Here the author suddenly exhibits a great wealth and variety of narrative material. One erotic episode follows another, and in comparison with the moral teaching the narrative develops, if not with complete freedom, at least with more freedom than usual. This is in the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, related in T.J., chaps. 3-9. To this story we now turn.

We begin with this question: whence is the origin of this wealth of narrative material which is suddenly revealed in the T.J. and completely overshadows the brief and simple account of Genesis xxxix? Are we to assume that it is the product of the narrator's imagination? But this same narrator proves himself very unimaginative in all other erotic passages. No, it is not wealth of imagination but wealth of tradition which comes to light in the T.J., mainly that of the tradition of the Greek Phaedra Legend, its variants and imitations. From this literary stratum, as we shall see,

¹ See A. Harnack, *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte*, 1895, p. 29.

² Cf. T. Reub. 3.11 f.; T. Levi 2.2, 5.3 f., 6.3 ff., 7.3; T. Jud. 8.2, chapters 10-13, 14.5 f.

originates the greater number of narrative themes and *motifs* which have found an unexpected home in the T.J. It is the use and re-shaping of Hellenistic themes in the spirit of the Jewish Haggadah, the combination and interlacing of themes of most varied origins, that make this mosaic of fiction a very attractive subject of research for the student of the history of literature.

In Genesis xxxix. 10, the Potiphar Story runs thus: 'And it came to pass, as she spake to Joseph day by day, that he hearkened not unto her . . .'; in the T.J., however, it takes the form of the description of numerous different attempts at seduction, which replace the summary relation of Genesis (Philo and Josephus put it differently).¹ One short biblical verse has been luxuriantly elaborated: it has become a compendium of narrative *motifs*. But before we attempt the analysis of these *motifs*, we must define our attitude towards a question involving textual criticism.

The thesis, proposed by F. Schnapp,² that in the T.J. we are confronted by two duplicates which can hardly be attributed to the same hand,³ has now gained general acceptance. R. H. Charles has added to the evidence supporting this thesis.⁴ We may add that Joseph's attitude changes completely from chap. 10 onwards. Whereas in the first narrative he is an eloquent admonisher and prosecutor, appearing before us as praying, fasting, weeping and being deeply moved, we see him in the second singularly taciturn and apathetic. And though the Potiphar Story plays its part in the second narrative, the erotic element which is the characteristic of the first is relegated to the background. Everything points to the conclusion that the second version of the tale of Joseph is one of the numerous interpolations which have forced their way into the TT. As a proof that at least the first version belongs to the old material of the TT., we may point out that there are threads of connexion between it and another Testament, the Testament of

¹ See Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

² *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, 1884, pp. 76 ff. Cf. W. Bousset in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, I., 1900, p. 188.

³ T.J., chapters 1-10.4 and 10.5-18.

⁴ *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, translated etc., 1908, p. 172, cf. pp. lx f. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II., 1913, p. 346.

Reuben, while the second version is completely isolated.¹ The Potiphar Story which is briefly outlined in the T. Reub. agrees with the first version of the T.J. not only in moral aspects but even in some places in the actual words.² It is also of importance to note that a characteristic detail of this version has already been referred to in the T. Reub., namely that the Egyptian woman sent *φάρμακα* to Joseph (T. Reub. 4.9, see pp. 57 ff.). Furthermore, one learns in T.J. 9.5 that the woman partially uncovered and adorned herself to seduce Joseph (*πρὸς ἀπάτην μου*). This is the same account and condemnation of feminine wiles and the feminine art of adornment that is expounded in a lengthy excursus in T. Reub. 5-6.4 (*δολιεύονται, δι' ἀπάτης* etc.). Finally, the angel of God and the evil Beliar are common to both the T. Reub. (4.11, 6.3) and the first narrative of T.J. (7.4). We restrict ourself in the following to this first narrative, and in doing so we are justified not merely by its completeness and individuality but also by its original position within the TT.

I. How often—thus Joseph begins to tell his children—has the Egyptian woman threatened him with death! How often has she had him chastised! And when he refused to give himself up to her, she promised to make him master over herself and all her possessions if only he would do so (3.1 f.).

Promises and threats occur frequently in the variants of the Phaedra Legend: The Egyptian woman in Josephus' paraphrase of the Potiphar Story (*Ant.* II, §48), Manto (*Xen. Eph.* II. 5.2), Demaenete (*Heliod.* I. 10), Arsace (*Heliod.* VII. 20, 25) seek to win the resisting youth by promises and to intimidate him by threats.³

The nature of the promise in the T.J. deserves our special interest (3.2): 'Thou shalt be lord of me, and all that is in mine house, if thou wilt give thyself unto me, and thou shalt be as our master.' Very similar passages are found on like occasions in the novels. Thus in Xenophon of Ephesus one of the pirates proposes in the name of the brigand chief

¹ For the theme of the second tale, viz. that Joseph out of brotherly love did not disclose to Potiphar and his wife that his *brothers* had sold him into slavery, see Philo, *De Jos.* §§247 ff. Also in Philo, Joseph from a similar motive conceals the fact that he is not a slave by birth but comes from a noble house. Both reports are evidently based on the same Haggadic tradition.

² T. Reub. 4.9 ~ T.J. 2.6; T. Reub. 4.10 ~ T.J. 10. .

³ See Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-6.

Corymbus to the captive Habrocomes the following (I. 16.4): 'But know that it is in your power to regain prosperity and liberty if only you will show yourself obedient to your master Corymbus! For he loves you passionately and is ready to make you master of all his possessions.' Of Melite who loves the intractable Clitophon it is written in Achilles Tatius (V. 11.6): 'Her husband has lately been lost at sea, and now she is willing to take this fellow to be—I will not say her husband, but—her lord and master; she offers him herself and all that she possesses.' This is followed by the vow (V. 14.2): '... and we took oaths, I to love her honourably, and she to make me her husband and declare me master of all that she possessed.' In the *Antiquities* of Josephus, a historian who likes to remodel single episodes into erotic stories, one hears from the lips of desperate youths a similar proposal (IV, §132). The commonplace of trying to break the resistance of an unwilling person by the offer of mastery over all the possessions has finally passed into Christian legend. In the Martinian Legend, it is again the seductress who promises to the hermit a house, gold, silver, and all things beautiful: *καὶ τούτων πάντων κύριον σὲ καταστήσω, μόνον εἶξον τῷ σκοπῷ μου*.¹ Very similar is the promise in the legend of St. Mary of Antiochia: *τούτων πάντων κυρία ἔσσι, ἐὰν μέλλῃς εἶναι μετ' ἐμοῦ*.²

It should be remembered that the *motif* of a threat of death, on the one hand, and the offer of rulership, on the other, occurs in the story of Gyges in Herodotus (I. 11). It is of greater importance in this context that, in the first version of Euripides' *Hippolytus*, Phaedra seems to have offered the rulership to her stepson. In Seneca's play, which undoubtedly is based to a large extent on that tragedy, Phaedra presses upon the youth the sceptre of Theseus, who was then detained in the underworld, and abases herself to be his slave (*Phaedra*, ll. 611-22).³ In the extant Euripidean drama the defence of Hippolytus, without

¹ See P. Rabbow, *Die Legende des Martinian*, in *Wiener Studien*, XVII., 1895, p. 281.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, 29th May, p. 53.

³ In Ovid, *Heroides*, IV. 163 f., Phaedra writes to Hippolytus: 'To my dowry belongs the Cretan isle of Jove—let my whole court be slaves to my Hippolytus!' In the Demaenete story the stepmother addresses the youth as 'heir' (I. 9).

apparent motive, against the reproach of having tried to obtain the throne through Phaedra's hand (ll. 1010 ff.), may well be a survival of the different first version.¹

Now it is entirely logical when in Seneca Phaedra offers the rulership of the lost husband to the youth and wants to make him her master, but the corresponding promise in the T.J. is quite unwarranted. How can the Egyptian woman dispose of herself, her goods and chattels when her husband is yet alive? He seems to be completely out of the picture. It would be different if at the same time his wife proposed his murder; but this comes as an entirely new temptation in 5.1 only (p. 55). The fact is, therefore, that the author of the T.J. has adopted a *motif* peculiar also to the Phaedra Legend, and has used it very crudely.

We cannot leave this episode without pointing out the great change in the character of the Egyptian woman. Here the biblical figure has assumed the traits of the Hellenistic-Oriental slave-keeper whose brutality in the enforcement of erotic desires knows no bounds.² Heliodorus' Arsace and Herondas' 'Jealous Woman' represent this type most effectively. An anonymous mime which O. Crusius has incorporated in his edition of Herondas³ contains a similar figure: the mistress, unsuccessful in her love schemes, orders the unwilling slave to be whipped; she threatens, even orders his execution, which is then carried out, though only in pretence. And if, later on, she tries to murder her own husband by poison, she is merely undertaking to do what the Egyptian woman, as we shall see (p. 55), proposes to Joseph.

II. The Egyptian woman continues to pester Joseph incessantly. Even by night she comes to him, under pretext of a visit. And having no male child, she pretends to treat him as a son. For a time she embraces the guileless youth. But later, when she wants to tempt him to fornication, he realizes what her object really is, and he is sad unto death. And when she is gone, he comes to his senses (3.6 ff.).

However improbable and strange it may appear that a slave, to whom the palpably sensual desires of his mistress are no secret, should take her 'motherly' caresses at face

¹ Cf. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Euripides' Hippolytos*, 1891, pp. 224-5.

² See Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

³ Fifth edition, Teubner, 1914, pp. 110 ff.

value and not perceive her true intentions, these pretences of false sentiments and this misunderstanding are very natural, when the scene is enacted between an amorous stepmother and a guileless stepson. Again we touch upon a Phaedra-Legend *motif*. In Heliodorus' novel, the Demaenete story to which we have already referred (p. 48) offers a striking parallel. Here the dual rôle of the woman as mother and would-be mistress has been developed in a very sophisticated and logical manner. No less skill is shown in describing the innocence with which the youth submits at first to the caresses of the stepmother: he becomes suspicious and adopts a defensive attitude only when these grow too passionate. Ovid's Phaedra expounds to Hippolytus very audaciously the advantages which the relationship of stepmother to stepson offers for the purpose of adultery (*Heroides*, IV. 139-146): 'Should someone,' she writes to him, 'see us embrace, we both shall meet with praise; I shall be called a faithful stepdame to the son of my lord. No portal of a dour husband will need unbolting for you in the darkness of night; there will be no guard to be eluded; as the same roof has covered us both, the same will cover us still. Your wont has been to give me kisses unconcealed, your wont will be still to give me kisses unconcealed. You will be safe with me, and will earn praise by your fault, though you be seen upon my very couch.' It constitutes a difference between Ovid, on the one hand, and Heliodorus and T.J., on the other, that in Ovid the stepmother cynically initiates the youth into the advantages of their relationship. The fundamental *motif*, however, is the same in all.¹

We read in Parthenius (XVIII) and in the aforementioned Demaenete story (Heliod. I. 10) that the seductress visits the youth by night.

III. She often flattered Joseph as being a 'holy man' and before her husband slyly extolled his chastity, while when alone with him she worked for his downfall. Publicly she praised him for being chaste, but in secret she said to him: 'Fear not my husband! He is convinced of your chastity.'

¹ In Seneca's *Phaedra*, Hippolytus displays filial affection for his stepmother. She, however, refuses the proud designation of mother (ll. 609 ff.): *Matris superbum est nomen et nimium potens; nostros humiliter nomen affectus decet; me vel sororem, Hippolyte, vel famulam voca...*

Even if someone told him about us, he would not believe it.' This episode (4.1 f.) is remarkable for its subtle psychology. It might have been conceived by any Greek novelist. Joseph's reputation for 'holiness' and 'chastity' and its use as a screen for evil deeds is evidently derived from the Euripidean tradition.¹ Phaedra's husband exclaims scornfully (*Hipp.* 948 ff.): 'Dost thou with Gods—O thou no common man—! | Consort? Art thou the chaste, the stainless one? | I will not trust thy boasts, for so should I | Impute to Gods unwisdom's ignorance. | Now vaunt, ay now!—set out thy paltry wares | Of lifeless food: take Orpheus for thy king: | Rave, worship vapouring of many a scroll: | For ah, thou'rt caught! I warn all men to shun | Such hypocrites as this; for they hunt souls | With canting words, the while they plot foul sin.'

IV. But when the Egyptian woman did not achieve anything in this way, she again came to Joseph, this time with the excuse that she wanted instruction in the word of God. She said to him: 'If you wish me to leave the false gods, then lie with me! I will also persuade my husband to forsake the false gods, and we shall walk in the law of your God.' Whereupon Joseph instructed her that God does not wish to see those who fear him (τοὺς σεβομένους αὐτόν) living in uncleanness, nor has he pleasure in adulterers. The scene ends with increased fasting and praying (4.4 ff.).

Even if one meets, for instance, in the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (XVIII) the situation in which the king's daughter, passionately in love with Apollonius, takes music lessons from him in order to be in his company, one must not fail to realize that the conflict on which Episode IV is built up is utterly alien to Greek thought. It is a specifically Jewish problem which dominates this episode. Its conception is only comprehensible against the background of Jewish proselytizing practice, and the problems connected with it.

If we wish to grasp the implications of this episode we must consider Rabbinical evidence as well as Jewish-Hellenistic authors and the New Testament. Rabbinical Judaism differentiates not only between half-proselytes, the

¹ I am indebted for this point to Mr. M. P. Charlesworth.

God-fearing, and full-proselytes, the 'proselytes of righteousness,' but also between false and true proselytes.¹ The category of the God-fearing is specifically mentioned in Episode IV: σεβόμενοι or φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν is the term, well-known from Josephus, the New Testament, and elsewhere, for the half-proselytes, the translation of the Hebrew equivalent 'God or heaven fearing.'² Furthermore, Joseph does not sacrifice his chastity to bring about the conversion of the Egyptian woman and her husband. On the contrary, he decisively rejects a conversion which is proposed on such selfish and immoral terms, and makes purity of conduct and of mind the primary condition. This foreshadows in a relatively early document those tendencies which are characteristic of later Rabbinical Judaism. The latter most vigorously fought false proselytes and altogether harboured a strong suspicion against them when importunate. The distrust was particularly active in the sphere of love and marriage in which Episode IV is laid. It is said in Yebamoth 24 b, for instance: 'Both when a man becomes a proselyte for the sake of a woman (to be able to marry her) and also when a woman becomes a proselyte for a man's sake. . . . then they are not proselytes. These are the words of Rabbi Nehemiah.'³ This attitude of late Judaism is well demonstrated by the conclusion of a Midrashic tale in which R. Hiyya, who lived about 200 A.D., plays a part: 'Then she went—a courtesan is meant—into the school of R. Hiyya and spoke to him: "Rabbi, have me made a proselyte!" He said to her: "My daughter, possibly you have cast your eyes upon one of my pupils".'⁴ It is very significant that the Rabbi immediately—and correctly—suspects a love story behind the woman's wish for conversion. In this case, however, the woman succeeds in proving the unselfishness of her intention. The 'historical' Midrash, which draws from everyday experience, illustrates the situation we meet in Episode IV. The implied supposition, there, is that Joseph

¹ See Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, II., 1924, p. 716. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I., 1927, pp. 336 ff.

² *Jos. Ant.* XIV, §110. J. Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, II., 1885, pp. 71 ff. Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 1926, p. 80.

³ Quoted from Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, II., p. 717.

⁴ Quoted from Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, I., p. 929, IV. 1, pp. 290 f.

would like to see the conversion of the Egyptian woman and her husband. It must, however, be noted that Joseph does not urge her to become converted to Judaism, but rather she herself proposes it. Active missionary work is as alien to him as unscrupulous proselytism. Instead he insists upon unconditional purity. This means that in the acceptance of proselytes severity combined with reserve is older than the actual Rabbinical Judaism, though this attitude was to become a characteristic feature in its spiritual physiognomy.

But Episode IV may yield more light on the history of early Judaism. The Egyptian woman comes to Joseph under the pretext of desiring to be initiated into the fundamental doctrines of his religion (*ἐπὶ λόγῳ κατηχήσεως*). This feature of the narrative is of great significance for the history of catechism.¹ It shows clearly that oral instruction in the doctrines of Judaism is a primary condition for the intending convert. It is noteworthy that as far back as the second century B.C. Judaism had developed a certain standard of instruction for would-be proselytes, a system which was later adopted and further developed by Christianity. The 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' throws light on the process of adaptation and development of this system of prior instruction. As C. Taylor has pointed out,² the chapters I-VI in this work which are concerned with the 'Two Ways' have their basis in a Jewish writing which evidently served as a means of instruction for intending proselytes. From this specimen it is possible to form an idea of the kind of instruction which is presupposed in Episode IV.

Finally, this episode of comparatively early date³ is of considerable interest because it portrays a situation so typical of the later and better known Jewish and Christian missions to the pagans: the woman shows herself to be most accessible to the new teaching and frequently induces husband and family to follow her.⁴ The certainty with which

¹ For *κατηχήσις* in the New Testament, see E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, I, 1921, p. 7.

² *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 1886.

³ Of course, in the T.J. we have always to reckon with the possibility that we are face to face with a later interpolation. Episode IV. might be one, although I see no compelling reason why it should be regarded as such.

⁴ See Bousset-Gressmann, *op. cit.*, p. 81. A. v. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, 4th ed., 1924, II., pp. 589 ff.

in the T.J. the Egyptian woman undertakes to persuade her husband to forsake his false gods and become a convert to Judaism, points to the frequency of such occurrences.

V. At another time she puts forward the proposal that if he dislikes committing adultery she will kill her husband by poison and make him her spouse. In greatest indignation Joseph repulses this suggestion and threatens to disclose her wicked intention to all. Then, full of fear, she begs him not to betray her and tries to cajole him by diverse gifts (chap. 5).

This episode forms another link in the great stream of Hellenistic-Oriental fiction and the tradition of the Phaedra Legend in particular. Two features must be kept distinct: the proposal of the woman, and the threat of the youth by which the woman is terrified.

As to the first of these features, the novelistic literature of late antiquity offers some parallels which by their striking similarity prove how customary the *motif* of such a proposal was. Thus in an episode of a novel by Xenophon of Ephesus, which much resembles the type of the Phaedra Legend, Cyno proposes to the captive Habrocomes that she shall murder her husband and then marry him (III. 12.4). After initial resistance Habrocomes gives in to the importunity of the woman and agrees, but flees full of horror after the ghastly deed is done. The next day he is falsely accused by the old woman of being his master's murderer. That the woman rids herself of her husband for the lover's sake and by means of poison, is also told in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (II. 27): '... , for it is she and no other that hath poisoned her husband, my sister's son, to the intent to maintain her adultery and to get his heritage.' In chapter 29 we hear an account of the same event given by the revived body of the husband: 'Verily, I was poisoned by the evil arts of my newly wedded wife, and so yielded my bed, still warm, unto an adulterer.' We mentioned before that the same takes place in a mime (p. 50).

According to Hyginus, *Poet. Astron.* II. 18, Anteia (otherwise called Sthenoboca) promises to Bellerophon the kingdom of her husband. It must be assumed that she intends to murder the latter. It is difficult to state exactly

whether it was Euripides who introduced this factor into his tragedy.

Nor is the proposal of the Egyptian woman in Episode V foreign to the Midrash:¹ . . . Joseph spoke: "I am afraid of my master." Then she spoke: "Him I shall put out of existence." "Is it not enough," he replied, "that I should be counted amongst the number of adulterers, shall I yet be numbered amongst the murderers?"

The second feature of the episode is the threat of Joseph that he will reveal her proposal to all. Terrified (φοβηθεῖσα), she begs him to keep silent, and indeed Joseph remains silent (this fact is not explicitly stated). The attitude of the two opponents agrees even in verbal similarity with the corresponding scene of the Euripidean *Hippolytus*, except for the significant fact that in Euripides the sequence of events follows more logically. In the tragedy handed down to us, it is not Phaedra herself, but the nurse who somewhat arbitrarily discloses the passion of her mistress to the youth. When the latter voices his deep abhorrence and threatens disclosure, the nurse, and Phaedra, who has overheard the quarrel between nurse and youth, are both thrown into a state of terror (ll. 565 ff.). The nurse implores him not to betray anything. Finally, he agrees, as he feels bound by his oath (ll. 656 ff.). Probably the derivation of Episode V from the literary tradition founded by Euripides would be even more evident if we were in possession of the lost tragedy, where Phaedra herself avowed and offered love to Hippolytus.

Servius states (on *Aeneis*, V. 118) that Bellerophon threatens Stheneboea, who also personally offers him her love, that he will acquaint her husband with this fact. Unfortunately, it cannot be ascertained whether this incident originates in the *Stheneboea* of Euripides. Stheneboea then forestalls Bellerophon's accusation with the well-known slander; and in the Euripidean drama also the threats of Hippolytus have the effect that Phaedra does not rely on his promised silence, but makes a counter-move (ll. 689 ff.). In the T.J., however, Joseph's threats in no way cause the

¹ Bereshit Rabbah, Par. 87 (Genesis, 39.8), in Wünsche's translation, p. 429. According to Talm. B. Yoma 35 b, Potiphar's wife seeks to win over Joseph by gifts of money. Compare the conclusion of Episode V.

woman to resort to any slander. We perceive that, by transposition into an alien story, the occurrence of the threat has lost its function in the general action which it possessed in the original context.

Finally, we must record the verbal similarity which exists between Euripides and the T.J.:

Eurip. *Hipp.* ll. 656 ff.:

εὖ δ' ἴσθι, τοῦμόν σ' εὐσεβὲς
σῶζει, γύναι | εἰ μὴ γὰρ
ὄρκους θεῶν ἀφρακτὸς ἤρέθην, |
οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἔσχον μὴ οὐ τὰδ'
ἐξεπεῖν πατρί.

T.J. 5. 2:

Γύναι, αἰδέσθητι τὸν Θεόν, . . .
ἐπεὶ καί γε γίνωσκε ὅτι ἐγὼ
ἐξαγγελῶ πᾶσιν τὴν ἐπίνοιάν
σου ταύτην.

These are the words of the youth which he addresses in the former to the nurse and in the latter to the mistress. But how inappropriate is the appellation of 'γύναι' for the mistress! And how very appropriate if spoken to the nurse! If we were to go back to the lost Euripidean *Hippolytus*, this appellation would undeniably be quite fitting if applied to Phaedra by the indignant youth. Furthermore, 'γίνωσκε' is obviously a Semitism; the Hebrew *jada'* means at the same time *γινώσκειν* and *εἰδέναι*. In the Greek source of the T.J., whether one pictures it as oral or written, the words, as in Euripides, will have been '(εὖ) ἴσθι'.

VI. Thereupon she sends to Joseph some food that has been mixed by magic. When the eunuch who brings it enters, Joseph looks up and espies a man of fearful aspect who, together with the dish, hands him a sword. He understands that the woman's intention is to lead him astray. Because of that he breaks into lamentations and tastes neither this nor any other of her dishes. After an interval of a day she comes to him, and when she notices the dish still untouched she asks him why he has not partaken of it. 'Because you have filled it with deadly magic,' is his reply. He reminds her that she had declared she would not serve the false gods but only the Lord. God, through his angel, had disclosed her wickedness to him; he had kept the food to convince her of her wickedness, hoping that the sight of the *corpus delicti* would induce her to repent. 'However, that you may learn that the wickedness of the godless has no power over

those who live in chastity and the fear of God, behold I shall take thereof and eat of it before your eyes.' After a prayer to the God of his fathers and to the angel of Abraham he eats of it. Then the woman sobbing falls on her face before his feet. But he raises her and admonishes her, and she promises him not to commit this godless act again (chap. 6).

Between this chapter and the preceding one there is a close connection. They are interlocked in their conclusion and beginning. As it is said there (5.4) that the Egyptian woman attempted to soothe Joseph 'with gifts and all sorts of good things', the despatch of the specially prepared dish appears therefore as a sequel and climax of these favours and advances. Further, while in the preceding episode the woman plans an attack against the life of her husband, here she endangers that of the youth. And if there she seemingly intends to employ a *φάρμακον*—unfortunately the text is not quite clear—here she uses a kind of *φίλτρον*, as it is correctly described in a paraphrastic reading of T.J. 6.5 (*θανατοῦ φίλτρον*). It is a well-known Hellenistic type of woman who is equally versed in poisoning and the dispensing of love-potions.

We must bear in mind that the *φαρμακεύτρια* may exercise her art as well for murder as for love-spells, and that even the preparation intended as a love-potion can have the most fatal consequences. Love-potions and murder by poison hang very closely together or merge one into the other in Hellenistic life and imagination. For instance, Theocritus' *φαρμακεύτρια* prepares a love-potion for the faithless lover (II. 58, cf. 15), but toward the end of the poem she threatens to kill him by poison if all the love-spells which she uses have no effect (II. 159 ff.). In Juvenal's famous description of the manners of Roman womanhood, philtre and poison are treated successively as ruinous weapons of feminine treachery (VI. 610 ff., cf. 133 f.). It is also very significant that Herod immediately suspects something evil when it is calculatedly whispered to him that his wife had intended to give him a *φίλτρον*; she is thereupon accused *ὕπὲρ τῶν . . . φίλτρων καὶ φαρμάκων*, and though innocent, executed (Jos. Ant. XV, §§223–231). On the other hand, Aretaphila, who actually intended to poison her detested

husband, the tyrant of Cyrene, defends herself with the explanation that she had only meant to give him a harmless *φίλτρον* (Plut. *Mul. Virt.* 256 BC). It is clear that the same fact can be interpreted as love-potion or poisoning. The borderlines are very indefinite.

A good illustration of this indefiniteness is found in Episode VI. The difficulty consists mainly in the fact that at first one cannot quite discover the real purpose of the proffered dish, whether it is poison or a love-spell. On the one hand, the dish is described as being full of *γοητείας θανάτου*. The symbol of the sword also points to death and destruction. Further, Joseph's prayer and demonstrative consumption of the food is logical only if it was calculated to have an immediate and fatal effect. On the other hand, the words '*βρώμα ἐν γοητείᾳ πεφυρμένον*' as well as the sentence '*καὶ συνήκα ὅτι περιέργεια ἐστὶν εἰς ἀποπλάνησίν μου*' indicate that the Egyptian woman is intent on love-magic, deception, and seduction. This intention is also demanded by the general action. In contrast to the situation in the parallel story of Apuleius, where the utterly desperate woman prepares a poison cup for the intractable stepson,¹ this passage of the T.J. is one amongst a number of attempted seductions. Finally, the intention of love-magic is clear also from the brief anticipatory mention of our episode in T. Reub. 4.8 ff.; but even there the 'hidden death' from which God has preserved Joseph is referred to. The contradiction is only an apparent one. Something that possibly happened frequently enough in those times, or if it did not actually happen was regarded as a possible or real fact, occurs in Episode VI as legendary fiction. The philtre is a poison which sooner or later causes death, or completely undermines sanity. Lucullus, Lucretius, and Caligula are probably the best known similar cases which are recorded by tradition.² Ancient evidence for the harmful

¹ Met. X. 4 f. This narrative motif, somewhat varied, occurs even in the report of a miraculous healing in Epidaurus. There we are told of a successful operation on a man into whose drink a stepmother had thrown leeches (No. 13), see R. Herzog, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus*, Philologus, Suppl. XXII. 3, 1931, pp. 14, 82.

² Lucullus: Plut. *Vit. Luc.* 43; Pliny, *N. H.* XXV. 7. Lucretius: Jerome, *Chronicle*, in *Eusebius' Werke*, VII., edited by R. Helm, 1913, p. 149. Caligula: Suet. *Calig.* 50; Jos. Ant. XIX, §193.

effect of the philtre could easily be multiplied. One example is sufficient: Plutarch (*Coniug. Praec.* 5 = 139 A) reminds the women who devise φίλτρα τινὰ καὶ γοητείας for their husbands that they act against their own interests if they sap their husbands' health in this manner. We read the description of an analogous case in a piece of fiction, in which a woman becomes mad and dangerously ill through the use of a love-potion.¹ In the T.J. the harmful effect of the 'philtre' is increased to an even more terrible extent.

Indubitably the use of philtres was widely popular in Hellenistic times. What does this statement imply with regard to subject-matter which consists—more and more evidently—of traditional material? A reference to the history of manners may explain the popularity and topical interest of a related event; in our case it can also make it clear how love-potions and poison cups are closely connected. Even then the specific literary problem remains unanswered. Are we not here confronted with a traditional narrative *motif*, namely that of the woman whose love is not returned, and tries to overcome the resistance of the youth by the use of a philtre? And if this is the case, whence did this *motif* find its way into the Potiphar Story of the T.J.? Actually, there is such a narrative *motif*, and it is noteworthy that this very *motif*—the starting point of the whole Episode VI—forms a bridge between the tradition of the Phaedra Legend and the T.J. The following verses of Propertius, which hitherto have been quite isolated, should be linked up here (II. 1.51 f.): *Seu mihi sunt tangenda novercae pocula Phaedrae, | pocula privigno non nocitura suo, | . . .* It is impossible to assume an attempt of poisoning. The context alone precludes it: the passage relating to Phaedra and Hippolytus is the first of three mythological examples of which the second and third describe, not the destruction, but the metamorphosis of human beings by means of magic. It would, therefore, be quite mistaken to regard the first example in the sense of an attempted murder. Thus we must infer from the verses of Propertius that a version of the Phaedra Legend existed in which the woman offered, or caused to be offered, *pocula*

amatoria to the stepson, which, however, failed to harm him. Does this feature also go back to Euripides' first *Hippolytus*? This assumption has been voiced, for instance, by U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 'Phaedra's magic has been turned into a fiction of the chambermaid which might well be omitted.'¹ Preller-Robert, with reference to Propertius, II. 1.51 f., support the same interpretation.²

We hope it will not be considered premature if we assert, in view of these facts, that the basic *motif* of Episode VI came into T.J. from the Greek Phaedra Legend. The episode itself, however, bears wholly the stamp of Oriental legendary formation. The eunuch and the angel, the symbol of the sword, the demonstrative consumption of the food—to sketch the action briefly—are evidently Oriental shoots grafted on that basic Greek *motif*. And it is the Jewish moralizing spirit which put the religious stamp on this fantastic legend. The case is instructive enough to justify an intensive discussion.

The Egyptian woman orders a eunuch to bring to Joseph the food mixed by love-magic. This feature of legendary fiction has parallels in history³ and novel literature. It reflects the refined courtly standard of life in the Orient. It should be remembered that, according to Xenophon, *Cyrop.* VIII. 2.4, Cyrus honours his servants and friends by sending them dishes from his table. Furthermore, we read in Plutarch's *Life of Cleomenes* (37.1) that it was the custom of the Ptolemies to give a banquet and presents to those who were going to be released from imprisonment. This feature recurs in a Greek novel, where it is utilized in the service of erotic action: Arsace, daughter of the Persian king and wife of the satrap of Egypt, honours and woos the beloved Theagenes not by sending him gifts only, but also dishes from her table; the dishes are brought in and served by eunuchs (Heliod. VII. 18 f., cf. 27). There is complete agreement between Heliodorus and T.J.: the Egyptian woman also

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 46. Cf. Eurip. *Hipp.* II. 509–516.

² *Griechische Heldensage*, II., 1921, p. 745, note 1. See also M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, I., 1898, p. 155. The scholium on Theocritus, II. 10, records that Phaedra practised love-magic in the lost Euripidean *Hippolytus*.

³ Cf., for instance, the account of the poisoning of the Emperor Claudius by the eunuch Halotus, on the instructions of Agrippina: Tacitus, *Ann.* XII. 66 f.; Suet. *Claud.* 44; Jos. *Ant.* XX, §148.

¹ Achilles Tatius, IV. 9 f., 15. She is, however, not saved by a god or an angel, but by a sleeping potion (IV. 16 f.).

tries to win Joseph 'with gifts and all sorts of good things', and she, too, sends him the dish through a eunuch. The detail, incidentally mentioned in T. Reub. 4.9, that she called in 'magicians' in connection with the love-magic, points to the same Oriental *milieu*. On the other hand, if in the corresponding section of Heliodorus neither love charms nor magicians are employed, it may be because this highly cultured author wished to limit the practice of crude magic to the lower classes.¹ In any case, it is of great interest to meet the same *motif* (namely, the high-born woman who sends eunuchs with food and gifts to the beloved youth) in two such different literary products, though it is true that they both belong to the Hellenistic Orient and the same type of fiction.

There can be no doubt that the eerie and grotesque manner of the appearance and manifestation of the warning angel can only be realized in an Oriental-Jewish world of fantasy. It is sufficient to mention as cursory counterproof the Greek examples of the epiphany of warning deities cited by Pfister.² No more suitable story could be found, however, than the Homeric Circe myth, for a more detailed comparison which will serve to make clear the specific characteristics of Jewish legendary formation. It contains close points of contact and offers possibilities of comparison not only in the epiphany but also in the general action. As Joseph is warned by the angel of the harmful effect of the magic food, so is Ulysses by Hermes. Both partake of the magic preparation without coming to any harm. And the Egyptian woman, as well as Circe, falls lamenting at the feet of the man. We shall not enter into the question as to a possible mythological or literary connection between the two stories. For the purpose of our comparison it is of no importance.

While the Ulysses of Homer meets Hermes in the shape of a comely youth who kindly offers him his hand and sympathetically addresses him (*Od.* X. 277 ff.), Joseph beholds a 'fearful' man (*φοβερόν ἄνδρα*). Here the Old Testament conception that the angel of God is 'fearful' to

look upon (Judges xiii. 6) is still alive. Josephus, on the other hand, is under the influence of the Greek aesthetic ideal of the deity when he no longer allows the angel to appear as a most 'fearful' man, but as a tall, beautiful youth.¹ There is also a fundamental difference in the manner in which Hermes, and the angel of the T.J., make their appearance. Whereas Ulysses, while on the way to Circe, meets the divine youth as though by chance, and the meeting is apparently quite as natural and uncomplicated as that of two human beings, the epiphany of the warning angel in the late Jewish legend is brought about in a most complicated and mysterious manner. The eunuch brings in the dish, Joseph looks up and sees a 'fearful' man who, with the dish, hands him a sword.² Clearly, in such fantastic and late legendary fiction one must never question how one should picture the transformation of the eunuch into an angel. We are here in the border region of apocalyptic literature, which flourished in Palestine particularly during the second century B.C. In this connection special attention should be paid to Joseph's 'looking up' and 'beholding'. Only when one becomes aware of the pregnancy of meaning in this 'looking up' and 'beholding', does one realize the underlying tone of the legend. We find in T.J.: ἀνέβλεψα καὶ εἶδον, as in a vision of the Book of Daniel (viii. 3): ἀναβλέψας εἶδον. But the similarities to (or perhaps even the derivations from) the introductory part of the great final vision in this work are particularly strong. This is the passage where Daniel describes his vision of the angel's epiphany as follows (x. 5): καὶ ἤρα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος . . . The description of the appearance of the angel and of the impression it makes on Daniel can be summarized in the adjective 'φοβερός'. The form of the manifestation is again in complete contrast to the Circe myth; it is visionary-apocalyptic. While Hermes warns Ulysses in eloquent words, advises him and explains to him the 'φύσις' of the *moly*-herb, the angel speaks through the mute symbol of the sword. Joseph, as an experienced apocalypticist, understands its meaning immediately, though

¹ *Antiquities*, V, §277. Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

² Cf. T. Benj. 7. The angel with the sword is also to be found in the Susanna Legend (59).

¹ Cf. Heliod. VI. 14 f.

² *R.E.*, Suppl. IV., pp. 296, 314 f.

the angel did not explain it, as is done, for instance, by God in Jeremiah i. 11 ff.

There are no possibilities of comparing with the Circe myth the entire passage §§ 3-6. For the characterization of this section we choose only the two features of Jewish moral teaching which have been introduced at this point—though in part not very happily. Thus Joseph asks the reproachful question: καὶ πῶς εἶπας ὅτι Οὐ προσεγγίζω τοῖς εἰδώλοις ἀλλὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ μόνῳ; As this reproach obviously refers to 4.4 f. (see p. 52), it is not quite justified; for there the Egyptian woman had made the abandonment of the false gods conditional upon Joseph's surrender to her. One can see how carelessly the author has connected the two episodes with each other. We often meet such discrepancies in the T.J. The other theme which should be briefly mentioned here is repentance, to which Joseph wants to bring the woman by the sight of the *corpus delicti*.¹ Just as the demand for repentance and penance is well-known to form the centre of Jewish and later also of Christian teaching, so it is continually demanded in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs who, having sinned, repent and do penance with great fervour.² Joseph's pastoral intention to lead the woman to repentance and penance is as far as possible removed from parallel pagan figures of similar stories (Phaedra Legend and others).

We reach here the climax of the whole Episode VI. Joseph passes to active demonstration of his religious zeal and trust in God: to prove to the Egyptian woman that the wickedness of the godless is of no avail against those who are pure and godfearing, after a short prayer he partakes of the food.³ At this point we can resume the thread of the

¹ To understand to the fullest extent Joseph's passionate indignation, one must bear in mind that to the Jew (love-)magic is no less a capital crime than murder by poison: Exod. 22.18; Deut. 18.10 ff.; Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* III, §§93 ff., 101; *Jos. Ant.* IV, §279. Cf. Didache, II, 2, V. 1.

² T. Reub. 1.9, 2.1; T. Sim. 2.13; T. Jud. 15.4, 19.2; T. Gad 5.6 ff., 6.3; T. Ash. 1.6; T. Benj. 5.4. Cf. Pirke Aboth, 4.13 (15), 22 (24). C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 1897, p. 70. Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 70 ff.

³ Joseph prays to God and to the angel, cf. T. Dan 6.2 and Genesis 48.15 f. In the prayers for revenge, found in Rhenea, God and the angels are invoked, see A. Deissmann in *Philologus*, LXI., 1902, pp. 253-265, or *Licht vom Osten*, 1923, pp. 351 ff. Cf. M. Gaster, *Studies and Texts*, II., 1925-28, pp. 733 ff. One finds these prayers, which deserve special interest as being Jewish inscriptions of early Hellenistic times, also in Dittenberger, *Syll. Inscr. Graec.*, 3rd ed., III., 1920, pp. 337 f., No. 1181.

Circe myth. How different are the facts there! Ulysses hastens to Circe in possession of an antidote, the *moly*-herb, and carefully instructed by Hermes, he can well afford to deceive the goddess and partake of the food whose harmlessness had been guaranteed to him beforehand. In the late Jewish legend, however, Joseph swallows the food at his own peril and of his own free will, fully conscious of its harmfulness. While Ulysses counts upon the counter-charm of the magic herb, Joseph relies upon the direct assistance of God and the angel, and this he does in the consciousness of his purity and chastity. What differentiates the late Jewish legend at this point from the Homeric episode is as much its ethical aspect as the immeasurable expansion of trust in God. To the Homeric man this boundless trust in God which characterizes the Jewish and Christian confessors and martyrs must necessarily be unknown; it presupposes the belief in the omnipotence of the one creator, of a God who rules as absolute sovereign over his creation, man and universe. Finally, the demonstrative value of the miracle which Joseph performs with the assistance of God and the angel is also most significant for the late Jewish legend. The miracle in question demands a more detailed analysis.

Unmistakably in the style of the Old Testament are the words with which Joseph informs the Egyptian woman of the demonstration which he proposes to make: "Ἰνα δὲ μάθῃς, ὅτι τῶν ἐν σωφροσύνῃ θεοσεβούντων οὐ κατισχύσει κακία τῶν ἀσεβούντων· ἰδοὺ λαβὼν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιόν σου ἐσθίω. It is sufficient to compare with it Exodus vii. 17: τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἐν τούτῳ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ τύπτω τῇ ῥάβδῳ τῇ ἐν τῇ χειρί μου ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ, καὶ μεταβαλεῖ εἰς αἷμα, and Exodus iv. 5: ἵνα πιστεῦσάσιν σοι ὅτι ὦπαί σοι κύριος ὁ θεός . . . (further Exodus xiv. 18). Very similar is the wording regarding a miracle of the New Testament, Mark ii. 10: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτίας. . . The above-mentioned miracles of the T.J., O.T. and N.T. naturally display considerable differences. We shall indicate here only the two most important. While the miracles taken from Exodus and Mark help to confirm and glorify the personal power of God, or the son of God, the miracle of the T.J.

tends to demonstrate a general religious and moral thesis. Like the TT. in general, the individual miracle of the T.J. is the vehicle of moral teaching. The second difference is that, while those miracles at the same time serve practical purposes, i.e. confirmation of the mission of Moses, deliverance, healing, this is solely a miracle of demonstration which the performer works on his own person, at the risk of his life. The existence of this type within Judaism in pre-Christian times is of great interest for the student of the history of religion. A digression may be permitted here.

According to the judgment of the most expert scholars who have studied the subject during the last decades, the sublime synoptic tale of the temptation of Jesus (Matthew iv. 1 ff.; Luke iv. 1 ff., cf. Mark i. 12 f.) is non-historical, that is to say, a mythical creation of the original Christian community.¹ 'It is purely mythical; it has nothing to do with the historical Jesus, but only with the supramundane Christ.'² However, with regard to the meaning and the tendency of the tale as a whole, as well as with regard to the origin of the individual details, the opinions of the scholars vary considerably. We believe that a new consideration can be set forth in explaining the origin of an important narrative *motif* which has presented great difficulty to exegesis. It is found in the 'second temptation' of Matthew, which corresponds to the 'third temptation' of Luke.

Satan takes Jesus to the pinnacle of the Temple of Jerusalem and invites him to throw himself down. Inciting him to the venture, Satan quotes Psalm xci. 11-12: 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and on their hands they shall bear thee up, lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone.' Where else does that happen which the tempter here demands? Where is it that anyone, trusting to be caught by kindly spirits, leaps into the depths and is gently lowered to the ground? And where, on the contrary, is some one miserably dashed to pieces because of ill-founded trust in the help of these benevolent spirits?

Here we must guard against a possible error. The action

¹ See A. Meyer, *Die evangelischen Berichte über die Versuchung Christi*, in *Festgabe Hugo Blümner*, 1914, pp. 434-468. Eitrem-Fridrichsen, *Die Versuchung Christi*, 1924. C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, II., 1927, pp. 18 ff., and others.

² E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, I., p. 94.

demanding of Jesus by the devil is not primarily derived from the verses of the Psalm; the peculiar use of those verses, on the contrary, presupposes the type of action and the narrative *motif*. Psalm xci does not imply that safety will be granted to the godfearing man who throws himself into the abyss, assuming that the angels will assist him. The sense of the verses, which are not at all obscure, is rendered by H. Gunkel as follows: 'He feels as though he floats along difficult paths, invisible hands carrying him over every obstacle! His foot hits against no stone (Prov. iii. 23).'¹ The following statement of J. Weiss: 'The temptation to throw one's self into the depths, trusting to the protection of God, which the Psalmist (xc. 11 f.) promises to every believer, but, according to the interpretation of the epoch, particularly to the Messiah . . .'² is, therefore, incomprehensible and utterly untenable. There is actually no mention whatsoever in the relevant passage of the Psalm of any such promise, nor does it consider at all the action of leaping into the depth. One could only refer to the Gospel narrative of the temptation to support any such assumption that in that period the verses were interpreted in this sense. But it is quite inadmissible not only to take Satan's sly improvisation seriously, but further to generalize it as well. We must not lose sight of one important conclusion for which we have to thank A. Meyer's valuable essay on the temptation of Christ: 'The narrative resembles an ingenious Jewish Haggadah.'³ The biblical quotation of the devil represents just as little a *communis opinio* as the countless, sometimes sophistic sometimes profound, biblical quotations found in Haggadoth of the Talmud and Midrash. The 'devilry' of this temptation lies a great deal in the very exegetical sophistry which makes it possible to recommend the insane proposal of a death leap by means of a biblical quotation. We see, then, that there is no sound foundation for believing that the verses inspired the narrative *motif*; they merely formed a support of the latter, to which they had to be adapted by a peculiar interpretation. We may now proceed to answer the problem raised above (p. 66).

¹ *Die Psalmen*, 1926, p. 405.

² *Die drei älteren Evangelien* (Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, I., 1917), p. 244.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 458.

The parallel for which we are looking is found in what is probably the most famous fairy-tale in Hellenistic literature, namely in Apuleius' tale of Cupid and Psyche. Obeying the order given by Apollo, Psyche is abandoned on the top of a precipitous mountain; then arises Zephyr, the gentle god of wind and Cupid's *famulus*, and with mild breath wafts the maiden down to the valley where he lowers her tenderly on the flowered lawn (*Met.* IV. 35). Afterwards, when the visit of her sisters is imminent, Psyche addresses the following plea to her husband Cupid (V. 6): *sed istud etiam meis precibus, oro, largire et illi tuo famulo Zephyro praecipe, simili vectura sorores hic mihi sistat* (cf. chap. 13). Zephyr obediently discharges his duty (V. 7): *nec mora, cum ille parens imperio statim clementissimis flatibus innoxia vectura deportat illas*. This action is twice repeated; but on both these occasions the sisters impetuously throw themselves off the cliff on their own initiative, and each time Zephyr is dutifully present to catch them (V. 14, 17). Later, when misfortune, caused by the envious advice of the wicked sisters, befalls Psyche and she loses her husband, she revenges herself on them in the following manner. She tells them, separately, of her divorce and Cupid's alleged wish to espouse the sister. Then each sister, acting independently, hurries to the rock and throws herself down, confident of Zephyr's obedience (*tu, Zephyre, suscipe dominam*) and is miserably dashed to pieces in the abyss (V. 27). This was what Psyche had intended. The inducement here implied of leaping into space, confident of the help of a god, would be a particularly good parallel to the Gospel story of the temptation, if one could assume that the devil's intention was not solely to cause Jesus to sin against God, but also to drive him to his death. This interpretation lends itself at any rate to Luke's account. It would lead us too far if we were to discuss all the possible reasons why Luke put the temptation of the leap as the climax at the end of the series; but one very obvious reason seems to be that this temptation, contrary to the others, comprises, in his view, an attempt against the life of Jesus. It is most significant that for Luke it is again the devil who drives Judas to the betrayal (xxii. 3, cf. John xiii. 2, 27), and so becomes the

chief bearer of the responsibility for the death of the Saviour. Therefore it is a completely logical assumption that Luke has taken the temptation of the leap as an intention of the devil to cause Jesus' death even before the beginning of his mission.

The fairy-tale character of the incident, already recognized as such by R. Bultmann because of its intrinsic nature,¹ is established with reasonable certainty by the evidence of the tale of Cupid and Psyche.² It has, of course, adopted a christianized form when used by the synoptists. The part of the *famulus* Zephyr is taken by the helpful angels, and instead of the steep crag we have the pinnacle of the Temple in Jerusalem which to the south towered to giddy heights above a deep valley.³ It will not be irrelevant to point out another fairy-tale feature which has a parallel in the story of Cupid and Psyche. In both narratives the action is divided into three parts; the three temptations of the devil are equivalent to the three visits of the sisters which have in part an incitative nature. In both the embodiment of malice and envy persecutes a god's elected (Jesus is God's son, Psyche a god's spouse). It need only be mentioned in passing that the transformation of stones into bread (first temptation) and the mountain from which one can behold all the realms of the world (third temptation) are also characteristic of fairy-tales.

Reverting to our discussion of the miracle, we quote the words by which M. Dibelius states the aim underlying the story of the Temptation:—'It is intended to establish above all the fact that, and the reason why, Jesus did not perform certain miracles: neither miracles of self-defence, nor spectacular miracles, like the leap from the Temple. It also intends to establish that he has done nothing to obtain power by human means. All this is of the devil—this is the lesson to be learned from the conversation (sc. between Jesus and the devil), and thus gives a moral to the Christ-

¹ *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1921, p. 156. Cf. Fridrichsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 29 f.

² This, of course, is not intended to be taken as meaning that the tale of Cupid and Psyche was the source of the Gospel story. We adduce the former merely as a parallel to demonstrate the fairy-tale character of the discussed incident in the latter.

³ Cf. Jos. *Ant.* XV. §412.

ians.¹ We are in this connexion chiefly interested in the refusal to tempt God by a spectacular miracle performed at the risk of one's life. Joseph's attitude in the T.J. is of high value as an opposite outlook to this religious conviction: he feels that it is in no way tempting God if of his own free will and after having prayed to God and the angel, as a demonstration, he partakes of the food of whose harmful nature the angel sent by God has only just warned him.

We have already mentioned (p. 60) the remark of Propertius that Hippolytus did not suffer any harm from Phaedra's love-potions. The reference is too brief to permit a view as to the circumstances of this episode. We may, however, take it for granted that Hippolytus did not drink the philtre as the demonstration of a religious truth. The *motif* thus appears to be Greek, but it has been Judaized, and later Christianized.

Jewish and New Testament teaching meet in the warning not to rush into danger on the strength of one's trust in God's miraculous assistance.² But this has not prevented the fact that in the popular literature of Judaism as well as of Christianity such spectacular miracles have become or remained familiar features. The spectacular miracle in the T.J. is not only noteworthy as a contrast, but also as a precedent. The episode to be considered in the following is enacted between the Apostle John and the Emperor Domitian, and is related in the apocryphal Acts of John (chaps. 8 f.). John praises Jesus Christ as the future ruler of the universe and as the son of God. Domitian demands a palpable proof thereof; words alone do not convince him. 'What canst thou show in earth or heaven by the power of him who is destined to reign, as thou sayest?' he asks the Apostle (chap. 9). And how curious that this of all things should immediately occur to John! He asks for a *φάρμακον θανάσιμον*, and drinks it after a prayer to Jesus, without coming to any harm. The close relationship between the two apocryphal miracle-episodes is evident. In both cases a poison is swallowed for the sake of religious demonstration. In both cases the hero says a prayer beforehand, which is

characterized in the older Jewish narrative by brevity and simplicity in the Old Testament style, in the later Christian tale by a plentiful display of rhetorical phraseology. We can realize from the St. John story that we are confronted with a spectacular miracle which had become conventional.¹ It is very significant with what promptness (*εὐθέως*) it occurs to the Apostle to choose this manner of demonstration. While in the T.J. the partaking of the food is still motivated by the general course of the action, this is no longer the case in the St. John story.²

Here we may also recall the early Christian miracle legend which dates back to Papias (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, III. 39.9): '... he relates ... another miracle connected with Justus surnamed Barsabas, for he drank poison (*δηλητήριον φάρμακον*), but by the Lord's grace suffered no harm.' Unfortunately, it cannot be ascertained from the brief reference of Eusebius whether Justus Barsabas emptied the poison cup as a demonstration or not.

As a conclusion of the Episode VI it is then related that the woman falls upon her face lamenting at Joseph's feet;³ he, however, raises and admonishes her, with a kindness that is alien to Hippolytus and similar pagan figures. Whereupon she promises him never again to commit this godless action. As at the beginning of the episode (p. 63), so here also at the end we find similarities with the Book of Daniel:

¹ The *motif* of miraculous escapes from poisoning is itself natural in an age in which unexplained deaths, which can be attributed to poison, are fairly common; it is a natural kind of immunity for the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* to possess. Hence the inclusion of this immunity in the false ending of Mark (xvi. 18). As soon as this ending was accepted it was inevitable that legends of apostolic escapes from poisoning should be supplied to fulfil the prophecy. The ostentatious character of the Johanne story shows a conflation of the Marcan story with the Joseph legend. Cf. further the story of the escape of St. Benedict. I owe this suggestion to the Rev. W. L. Knox.

² In the Acts of Andrew and Matthew (2), the Apostle Matthew drinks a magic draught without coming to any harm; but he does it under compulsion and not as a demonstration, and he says no prayer. S. Reinach has discussed the legend in *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, I., 1905, pp. 395 ff.

³ The woman falls at the feet of the youth: Parthenius, XIV (in the poem of Alexander, the Aetolian); Sen. *Phaed.* ll. 666 ff., 703, cf. Ovid, *Heroid.* IV. 149 ff. Probably in the first Euripidean *Hippolytus*, Phaedra on her knees begged the youth for his love.

¹ *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1933, p. 274.

² See E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 1927, p. 29.

Dan. x. 9 ff. . . ἐγὼ ἤμην
πεπτωκὼς ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἰδοὺ χεῖρα
προσῆγαγέ μοι καὶ ἤγειρέ με
ἐπὶ τῶν γονάτων . . . καὶ εἶπέν
μοι Δανιηλ, ἄνθρωπος ἐλεεινὸς
εἶ.

T.J. 6.8: 'Ἡ δὲ . . . ἔπεσον
ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς εἰς τοὺς
πόδας μου κλαίουσα καὶ ἀνα-
στήσας αὐτὴν ἐνουθέτησα.

'Ἐνουθέτησα' in the T.J. corresponds to the sympathetic words of the angel in Dan. x. 11.

VII. Lamenting, the Egyptian woman pines away. Her husband in his ignorance orders (medical) care for her though she is not really ill. Then it happened that she seized a good opportunity when her husband was not present to fling herself at Joseph with the words: 'I shall hang myself or throw myself [into a well or] over a precipice if you will not lie with me.' But Joseph perceives that the spirit of Beliar plagues her, and after a prayer to the Lord, asks her to consider that in the event of her suicide her rival Astetho, the concubine of her husband, will beat her children and expunge her memory from the earth. This warning paradoxically is interpreted by the Egyptian woman as a declaration of love: 'You love me! This alone is sufficient to satisfy me that you care for my children's life and for mine, and I live in hope that I may yet appease my desire.'

This episode (chap. 7) is devoid of the mythical and aretalogical element that puts such a peculiarly Oriental and fantastic mark on the previous one; instead it is more definitely based on the Greek tradition of the Phaedra Legend. We can even assert that in none of the episodes in the T.J. is the dependence on this stratum of fiction as unmistakably apparent as here. For we are concerned with *motifs* which recur incessantly in the Phaedra Legend and its variants, from the time of the Euripidean drama, and are much more suitable there than in the late Jewish legend.

Even a brief survey will give some idea how closely this episode is linked up with the tragedy of Euripides. Phaedra is 'ill', and so is the Egyptian woman. The nurse questions her—for a long time in vain—to find out what is really ailing her (*Hipp.* ll. 271 ff.); this is also the husband's

endeavour in the T.J. There the nurse tends Phaedra,¹ here the husband nurses or orders the 'patient' to be nursed. There Phaedra has at first the intention of escaping her hopeless passion by a long drawn-out suicide, and this intention puts strong pressure on the nurse (ll. 276 ff., 401 f.); here the Egyptian woman threatens suicide. Phaedra hangs herself; the Egyptian woman threatens to do so. And from Joseph's mouth we hear the same warning with which in Euripides the nurse seeks to break Phaedra's will to die (ll. 304 ff.).

We will now examine in detail the narrative elements of Episode VII.

Since J. Mesk has carefully discussed both subjects, it is superfluous to deal anew with the story of Phaedra's illness and that of her male counterpart, Antiochus, whose love for his stepmother Stratonice is as passionate as it is hopeless.² We only wish to point out that in the T.J. the *motif* of the sickness already plays the same part in the narrative technique as in the much later variant of the Phaedra Legend by Apuleius. In this tale, which refers in distinct words to the tragic model, the violently impassioned stepmother contracts a serious illness which here again is mistaken for a physical disease and medically treated (*Met.* X. 2). It is this 'illness' which permits her to be alone with the youth and gives her a favourable opportunity to woo him.³

There is further proof that the *motif* of love-sickness which, mistaken for physical illness, affords an opportunity for a *tête-à-tête* and a proposal of love has been transferred to the Potiphar Story from a variant of the Phaedra Legend. In the structure of the variant *à la* Apuleius the sick-bed scene is not one episode amongst many, as in the T.J., but a distinct and important stage in the development of the action: the decisive step of the first avowal of love which indeed seems to require an internal motivation and more details of external circumstances. In the T.J., however, the

¹ Eurip. *Hipp.* l. 186. The nurse considers consulting physicians (l. 296).

² *Rheinisches Museum*, LXVIII., 1913, pp. 386 ff.

³ The conformity goes even as far as the actual wording, Apul. *Met.* X. 3: *tunc illa nanta solitudinis damnosam occasionem prorumpit in audaciam* . . ., cf. T.J. 7.3.: τότε οὖν εὐκαιρίαν λαβοῦσα εἰσεπήδησε πρὸς με, . . .

facts in question have not only lost this function of narrative technique, but they also stand in a certain contradiction to the preceding episodes: in Episode VII the occasion for a *tête-à-tête* and amorous offer is fully motivated, though up to then the same woman has approached Joseph quite freely and without any consideration for the husband. The episode in question is not even the one in which the final break is made between Joseph and the Egyptian woman, an episode which would have merited more detailed treatment, but which—unlike other renderings¹—is related without any detail in the T.J. The narrative art of the T.J. proves itself again and again to be very clumsy; it is as far removed from the concise style of the old Hebrew legends as from the narrative technique of the rhetorically trained Hellenistic authors.

It is of interest to observe that the incident of the sickness, once introduced into the Potiphar Story, has survived in it. Later on, however, it lost its original meaning. In the paraphrase of Josephus (*Ant.* II, §45) as well as in a very similar Talmudic tradition, the woman only shams illness, and that solely as a pretext for staying at home while all the others—with the exception of Joseph—take part in some religious feast.²

The Egyptian woman threatens to kill herself if Joseph does not surrender to her will. What about the *motif* of suicide? In the biblical writings it has not yet become a narrative *motif*. Men like Saul, Ahitophel, and Zimri are historical figures, while in the figure of Samson historical are mixed with legendary elements. But it is also of importance that none of these biblical suicides puts an end to his life because of sentimental reasons. Honour, despair of success, and thirst for revenge drive them to this step. These are men who know how to live and die manfully,³ quite in contrast to the emotional young men and women of Hellenistic literature who take their lives because of unrequited love. Moreover, even in the later Jewish literature suicide as a narrative *motif* has not established itself, that is to say, it

¹ Compare the Potiphar Story in Genesis, Philo, Josephus; further, the similar stories in Heliodorus, I. 10, and Apul. *Met.* X. 4.

² See Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 ff.

³ Cf. 2 Macc. xiv. 41 ff.

does not become an ever-recurring commonplace of novelistic-haggadic fiction. For religious and sociological reasons which we cannot discuss here, it occurs very rarely. One of the earliest examples is to be found in the Book of Tobit, a didactic novel, originally, like the T.T., written in Aramaic or Hebrew, probably of pre-Maccabean time (about 200 B.C.). Sarah, a Jewish girl in Ecbatana, wishes to hang herself in her sorrow, as she has been reproached with the unhappy fact that all her husbands, seven in number, have been smitten by death on the wedding night (3.7 ff.). Here the idea of suicide is not only employed as a means of novelistic fiction, but is also brought nearer to the sentimental sphere. On the other hand, the Jewish narrator does not go to the length of letting the girl resolve on suicide out of love for her deceased husband, as a Greek novelist would have done. This degree of sentimentality is unattainable by the author. With him, the reaction of the girl is due to the influence of Old Testament family morality: she feels the loss of her husbands and her childlessness as a load of shame. It is the same family morality that finally restrains her from suicide (3.10 ff.). Nevertheless, Sarah's attitude is not that of a woman of the old biblical type. The latter also suffers deeply from her childlessness though she harbours no thoughts of suicide, but possibly of death. It is instructive to consider the story of Hannah, Samuel's mother (1 Samuel i. 1 ff.), a story which may possibly have been in the mind of the author of the Book of Tobit, who narrates his tale in biblical style. Hannah also has to bear insults because of her childlessness, but, though she suffers deeply under these insults, she does not contemplate suicide. She, too, turns in prayer to God, but craves, not death as a release from her shame, but the gift of a male child. Rachel, on the contrary, cries out to her husband (Genesis xxx. 1): 'Give me children, or else I die.' These words do not contain a threat of suicide, but the fear, even the certainty, of the childless woman that despair and shame will destroy her. There is good reason to believe that, although her motives are still of the Old Testament type, Sarah's attitude is already influenced by the spirit of Hellenistic modernity, which up to a point even the orthodox Jew could not escape.

It is not surprising that the suicide *motif* in the T.J. which, in the passage under discussion, is directly dependent on Hellenistic fiction should be used entirely in the spirit of Hellenistic narrative technique. The Egyptian woman wants to kill herself because of hopeless love: thus the suicide *motif* is here wholly sentimentalized. She threatens to commit suicide and seeks, in coldly calculating fashion, to put pressure on Joseph: the *motif* has therefore been made to serve the *ratio* of passion. Both the sentimentalization and the special technical use of suicide as a threat are as unbiblical as they are characteristically Hellenistic.

There are so many instances in Hellenistic literature of suicide or intention of suicide because of desperate love that it is unnecessary to give individual examples here.

Nor is this the place to show how frequently and for what different purposes the Hellenistic authors make use of the *motif* of threatening to commit suicide. It is sufficient to establish the connection with the Phaedra Legend, and, for the rest, to quote only those cases in which the threat is uttered in a similar situation and with a similar intention.

The Euripidean Phaedra does not expressly put the alternative before her nurse: Obtain for me the favour of the youth, or I shall take my life! but her most definitely expressed will to die has actually the effect that the nurse finds herself confronted with such an alternative. Not plagued by moral scruples, she immediately tries to win over the youth, so as to keep her mistress alive (cf. ll. 496 f.). In the drama of Seneca also, Phaedra seems at first firmly resolved to put an end to her passion by committing suicide (ll. 250 ff.). In this play the scene between mistress and nurse—probably dependent on the first Euripidean *Hippolytus*—has been worked up to a dramatic climax: here Phaedra's announcement of her intended suicide causes the complete change in the attitude of the nurse, who, hitherto a fervent advocate of decency and the suppression of the evil passion, now cries to her mistress (l. 269): *Contemne famam!* She promises to leave nothing undone that might soften the heart of the youth, if only her mistress will abandon the idea.

The relationship between the T.J. and the Phaedra Legend is clearly in evidence, and in the following will be

still more firmly established (p. 80). The deviations are very naturally explained from the given facts of the Jewish legend to which the Hellenistic apparatus of *motifs* had to adapt itself. For the figure of a nurse is unknown to the Jewish legend. In the T.J., as in Josephus, Joseph plays the part not only of the opponent, but also of the admonisher of his mistress, i.e. he has taken over the part of the nurse as confidential adviser.¹ In Episode VII the non-existence of the nurse has also this effect, namely, that the Egyptian woman does not announce her suicidal intention to the nurse, an announcement which might easily be understood as a threat or compulsion, but herself puts the alternative before the youth: Do as I will, or I shall kill myself! The barefacedness of the demand is in noticeable contrast to the drama of Seneca, where it is left to the nurse to draw all inferences, and where it is intentionally left in doubt whether Phaedra is seriously resolved to commit suicide, or only wants to extort the assistance of the nurse by the threat of it. But the same open and barefaced language is to be found in the Arsace episode of Heliodorus (VII. 10), which is strongly dependent on the tradition of the Phaedra Legend. Arsace implores her old nurse Cybele to use every means to win over the youth—'if you want your foster-child to survive; for it is impossible for me to go on living unless I possess him.'

It is not, however, altogether foreign to the tradition of the Phaedra Legend that Phaedra herself should hint to Hippolytus of her suicidal thoughts, naturally with the intention thereby to make him more responsive to her advances. Thus she writes to him in a poem of Vincentius: *Dum volo, dum nolo, dum vincor scribo repugno, | Suspensos collo laqueos rogatura resolvi.*² Though this poem is of much later date it is indubitably based on older models.

It is a peculiar coincidence that the story of Stratonice and Combabus should contain the closest parallel to the suicidal threat of the Egyptian woman; peculiar because this tale and cult-legend, originating from Hellenistic Syria, has been transformed under similar conditions to

¹ See Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

² *Anthologia Latina*, ed. A. Riese, I. 1, No. 279, ll. 19–20.

the Jewish Potiphar Story which developed in the neighbouring Palestine. The later development of the Syrian as well as of the Palestinian tale stands under the influence of the Phaedra Legend. With regard to the threat of suicide, Stratonice threatens Combabus in similar fashion and with the same intention as the Egyptian woman threatens Joseph (pseudo-Lucian, *De Syria Dea*, XXII): ἀπειλούσης δὲ μέγα τι κακὸν ἑωυτὴν ἐργάσασθαι, δείσας πάντα οἱ λόγον ἔφηρε . . .

If, however, the connection between the suicidal threat uttered in the T.J. and the tradition of the Phaedra Legend should not be obvious to the reader, it must at least be admitted that it is a typically Hellenistic narrative motif. Two characteristic passages from Hellenistic fiction should be sufficient to demonstrate this. In Charito I. 4.2, it is said that the lover won the maiden only because he made her valuable presents, and declared that he would hang himself if he could not obtain the object of his passion (. . . τῷ τε λέγειν ἀπάγξασθαι μὴ τυχὼν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας). In the story of Dinias and Chariclea, the maid reports to the youth again and again the tears and sleepless nights of her mistress and the danger that she might finally hang herself because of hopeless passion (. . . καὶ τέλος ὡς ἀπάγξει ἑαυτὴν ἢ ἀθλία ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος . . .), tales which do not fail to have effect on the guileless youth.¹

The Egyptian woman does not threaten suicide in general terms; on the contrary, she specifies in what manner she will put an end to her life. Unfortunately, in this passage the MSS. are once again at variance. According to the majority of the manuscripts, the woman is going to choose between strangling herself and leaping over a precipice; according to the rest, she also considers throwing herself into a well (ἄγχομαι ἢ εἰς φρέαρ ἢ εἰς κρημνὸν ἑμαυτὴν ῥίπτω).

It is a critical principle of long standing to give *a priori* particular credence to the *lectio difficilior*, and εἰς κρημνὸν is such a 'difficult reading.' According to the usual Greek idiom, we should rather expect ἀπὸ or κατὰ κρημνοῦ.² Therefore κρημνός cannot be interpreted here as a slope or rock from or over which, but must be read as an abyss into

¹ Lucian, *Toxaris*, XIV. Cf. Parthenius, V.; Jos. *Ant.* XII, §188.

² Cf. Mark v. 13; Luke viii. 33.

which some one throws himself. It is remarkable, and proves the quality of the reading εἰς κρημνόν, that in two other passages (so far as I can see, the word does not occur elsewhere in the TT.) the translator uses κρημνός in the sense of abyss, a place into which some one is thrown or throws himself, as the Egyptian woman in the T.J. wishes to throw herself εἰς κρημνόν. In T. Reub. 2.9, it is written: . . . , καὶ αὕτη (= ἄγνοια) τὸν νεώτερον ὁδηγεῖ ὥσπερ τυφλὸν ἐπὶ βόθρον καὶ ὡς κτήνος ἐπὶ κρημνόν. Here κρ. in the so-called *parallelismus membrorum* is nearly synonymous with βόθρος, 'pit'. In T. Jud. 2.4, we meet εἰς τὸν κρ.: τὴν ἄρκον λαβὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποδὸς ἀπέλυσεν εἰς τὸν κρημνόν, καὶ συνετρίβη. In the LXX. we find κρ. only once, and that is in 2 Chron. xxv. 12: . . . ἔφερον αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ κρημνοῦ καὶ κατεκρήμνιζον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκρου τοῦ κρημνοῦ . . . Here עֶבֶר, 'rock,' has been translated by κρ. This, however, cannot be the Hebrew word which the translator has rendered κρ., because then one would have to expect ἀπὸ κρ. instead of εἰς κρ. We are assisted by βόθρος, a word that in T. Reub. is used parallel with κρ. In the LXX., βόθρος is frequently the translation of בֹּר, 'pit,' as a glance at the Concordance of Hatch-Redpath shows.¹ I shall refrain from any conjecture as to which Hebrew word underlies the κρ.-passages in T. Reub. and T. Jud. With regard to our passage in T. J., however, in all probability κρ. is here the translation of בֹּר. Proof thereof is the occurrence of the alternative ἢ εἰς φρέαρ ἢ εἰς κρ. in some MSS., instead of simply εἰς κρ. When I put to Mr. H. Loewe the question as to which Hebrew word might underlie the alternative ἢ εἰς φρέαρ ἢ εἰς κρ., he immediately suggested בֹּר, and pointed out that בֹּר, 'pit,' had frequently been confused with בְּרַעַר, 'well.' Inferring from MSS. evidence and from the aforementioned passages in T. Reub. and T. Jud. that κρ. is the original reading, we must assume that the version εἰς φρέαρ is based on a misunderstanding or corruption of בֹּר. The alternative ἢ εἰς φρέαρ ἢ εἰς κρημνόν represents, in other

¹ In other passages in the LXX., עֶבֶר has been translated by λάκκος (1 Sam. xiii. 6, we find βόθρος and λάκκος in juxtaposition). The pit, too, into which the brethren throw Joseph is called λάκκος (Genesis xxxvii. 20, 22, 24, 28 f.). The word seems to have become typical of the Joseph story; for the translator of the TT. uses λάκκος only in connection with Joseph, cf. the index in Charles' edition of the *Testaments*.

words, a later compromise between the erroneous translation *φρέαρ*-בֹּרַי (בְּאֵר) and the correct one *κρημνός*-בֹּרַי.

The interpretation of the matter again reveals close connections between the T.J. and the tradition of the Phaedra Legend. The Egyptian woman seeks to impress Joseph by describing the means of suicide between which she will possibly make her choice. Phaedra, in Seneca's drama, is also cruel enough to discuss before the anxious nurse the *fati genus* (ll. 259 f.): 'With the noose shall I end my life, or fall upon the sword? or shall I leap headlong from Pallas' citadel?' Besides suicide by the sword, Phaedra, as we see, thinks of self-strangulation (which is actually Phaedra's mode of death in the Euripidean drama), and of leaping into the abyss (which, in contrast to the T.J., is well motivated here by the Athenian locality).¹ The same series of suicidal possibilities is to be found in Apuleius, *Met.* IV. 25, a passage which seems to be dependent on Seneca. Here the unhappy maiden, forcibly separated from her betrothed, bursts into the despairing words: 'Alas! now I am utterly undone, now I am out of all hope. O, give me a knife to kill me or a halter to hang me, or a precipice that I may throw me down therefrom.' The Damaenete and the Arsace episodes in Heliodorus' novel, which are both in the tradition of the Phaedra Legend, must be mentioned in this connection. Damaenete commits suicide by leaping into the abyss, into the 'pit', which here again is motivated by the Athenian locality (I. 17): 'So when she came to the pit (τὸν βόθρον) in the Academy (you know the place) where the polemarchs offer the customary sacrifices to the heroes, she suddenly . . . threw herself headlong in.' Arsace, on the other hand, hangs herself after Theagenes has been forcibly carried off (VIII. 15).

Though in our view the well *motif* does not belong to the original version of the T.J., it is worth while to dwell on it briefly. We are of the opinion that the erroneous reading *εἰς φρέαρ* has been favoured by the fact that suicide or death in a well was a familiar feature in Hellenistic fiction. In the Anagyrasius story, handed down by Suidas, which is of the type of the Phaedra Legend, the slanderous woman throws

¹ Cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs*, ll. 129 ff.

herself into a well, while the man hangs himself.¹ In another story of the Phaedra type, the tale of Antheus, the youth perishes in the well through Cleoboea's treachery, while she hangs herself (Parthenius XIV). In Apuleius, *Met.* VIII. 22, a woman commits suicide with her child by jumping into a deep well.²

Joseph counters the suicidal threat of the Egyptian woman with the warning that if she kills herself, her rival Astetho, the concubine of her husband, will ill-treat her children (7.5): 'Remember that if thou kill thyself, Astetho, the concubine of thy husband, thy rival, will beat thy children, and thou wilt destroy thy memorial from off the earth.'³ In a similar situation—though here we have not only a threat of suicide but its actual performance—the nurse in Euripides predicts impressively to her languishing mistress the future sad destiny of her bereaved children (*Hipp.*, ll. 304 ff.): 'Howbeit know thou—then be waywarder|Than is the sea—thy death shall but betray|Thy sons, who shall not share their father's halls—|No, by that chariot-queen, the Amazon,|Who bare to thy sons a bastard over-lord,—|Not bastard-minded,—well thou knowest him,|Hippolytus.'⁴ In both cases it is a question of a concubine, only with the difference that the mother of the bastard Hippolytus represents a distinct mythological person, the 'Amazon', as she is simply called without specified name in Euripides,⁵ while the Bible knows nothing of Astetho. This figure, with the warning in which she plays a part, has, in all probability, passed over from the parallel Greek to the Jewish sphere of fiction. Perhaps even the name Astetho⁶ might be explained as a corruption of 'Amazon'. This, naturally, is no more than mere conjecture.

It must also be noted that the stepmother or stepchild *motif* is not to be found in other biblical or apocryphal writings. On the other hand, it forms part of the traditional

¹ See Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 2nd ed., 1889, p. 621.

² See also Plut. *Amat. Narrat.* 3 (773 D).

³ The phraseology is biblical (LXX.): *κονδυλίζω*, cf. Malachi iii. 5; Amos, ii. 7:—τὸ μνημόσυνον, cf. Esther, ix. 28; Job, xviii. 17; Ps. ix. 7, xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 17, cviii. (cix.) 15.—*ἡ ἀντίζηλος*, cf. p. 83, note 2.

⁴ Cf. ll. 313 ff., 421 ff. See also *Alcestitis*, ll. 304–310.

⁵ In Seneca she is called Antiope (*Phaed.* l. 227).

Other readings are *Σηθώ*, *Σωή*, *Ασιθώ*.

stock of Greek literature.¹ A brief sociological explanation of this state of things may be attempted in passing. While from the earliest times the Greek and Roman family was based on monogamy, polygamy is the general custom in ancient Israel and Judah, and even in Rabbinical times was not completely discarded: only the *herem* of R. Gershom (tenth-eleventh century) legally put an end to polygamy. But it is in the family built on a monogamous basis that the relationship between stepmother and stepchild so easily assumes the painful features of animosity with which we are familiar in daily life and also in world literature. Monogamy means centralization of family life under the rule of one parental couple. For the stepchild this implies complete subjection to the stepmother or mistress of the house. The sufferings of the stepchild are, in other words, a consequence of the monarchic position of the mistress of the house in the monogamic family. On the other hand, polygamy means decentralization of family life, the unity of which is safeguarded by the great power and authority of the father of the family. The more women, the more restricted is the sphere of action and power of the individual woman, and the more concentrated and comprehensive the power of the master of the house. At his death his authority passes on to his eldest son. While all the children, even those of the concubine, have a right to inheritance, wives are debarred from it. In such a family system the problem of the clash between stepmother and stepchild cannot arise, so that the Bible does not even contain words for stepmother, etc. For when the mother dies, the child does not come under the power of a strange woman: the father, standing authoritatively above the individual women and their children, will watch with special jealousy over the motherless child, guarding it from injustice. That the concubine should tyrannize over the children of the dead wife is an impossible assumption under these social conditions. When Sarah, for instance, persuades her husband to cast out his concubine Hagar and her son Ishmael, she does not do so because she is afraid that Hagar might beat her own son Isaac, or that

¹ Compare, e.g., the stories of Phineus (Soph. *Antig.* 966 ff.; Diod. IV. 43.3 f.), Phrixus (Pind. *Pyth.* IV. 162), and Phronima (Herod. IV. 154).

83
IN GRAECO-ORIENTAL LITERATURE
Ishmael could deprive him of his inheritance; she does it, on the contrary, because she wishes to see Ishmael excluded from the inheritance (Genesis xxi. 10). It is significant that at first Abraham resists Sarah's suggestion, and this not because of Hagar but for Ishmael's sake. The importance of the mother is much less than that of the son, and even the child of the concubine is precious to its father.¹ A special command from God is necessary before Abraham actually expels Hagar and Ishmael. What the legend relates here was, therefore, an unusual event, for generally both the legitimate wives and the concubines, as well as the children of the various mothers, enjoyed equal protection from the head of the family. Only after his death, and then under exceptional conditions, might it happen that the sons of the legitimate wife would cast out the son of the concubine (e.g. the expulsion of Jephthah clearly presupposes the death of the father, Judges xi. 1 ff.), or that the son of the concubine, e.g. Abimelech, would murder his legitimate brothers (Judges viii. 31 f., ix. 1 ff.).

In post-exilic times monogamy was steadily increasing amongst the Jews. With this increase the position of the wife improved correspondingly, as is attested by the Rabbinical institution of the *Kethubba*, that is, the economic safeguarding of the wife in case of widowhood or divorce. Unfortunately, it cannot be ascertained at what pace this process of development went on, and in what numerical relationship the polygamous and monogamous marriages stood to each other at the time of the composition of the TT. (second-first century B.C.). But the percentage of polygamous marriages of that period must not be put too low, considering that Josephus, a witness of a more recent period, incidentally states (*Ant.* XVII, §14): 'For it is an ancient custom among us to have several wives at the same time.'² If one should be inclined to assume, even in face of this evidence, that toward the end of the second century B.C. polygamy was exceptional and only a luxury of the rich,

¹ Only in later times does bastard (*mamser*) become a very offensive term. This, too, is a consequence of the process in which monogamy became dominant. Cf. S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, II., 1911, p. 31.

² A second wife or a concubine is apparently referred to in Sirach, 26.6, 37.11: ἀντίγλος, as also in the T.J., is a conventional term and the translation of אֵשֶׁת חָנָן (cf. 1 Sam. i. 6) See Krauss, *op. cit.*, II., p. 27.

this would not really matter so far as our literary problem is concerned. For the subject-matter of fiction often changes at a slower rate than the social reality: the 'stepmother' might long have become a social phenomenon before she made her entry into literature.¹

In the passage under discussion, which is unique in biblical and apocryphal literature, Joseph uses the bogey of a wicked stepmother to frighten the Egyptian woman. He does not speak, however, of a wife whom Potiphar could marry after her suicide, but of Astheto, the concubine. One can see that the unfamiliar figure of the stepmother has been transplanted into the polygamous family relationship to which it does not really belong (cf. Sarah and Hagar). In Seneca, on the other hand, Phaedra describes herself as *noverca*,² a conception of the relationship between the legitimate wife and *vóthos* unknown to the Euripidean drama: the stepmother *motif* so beloved by Greek and Roman writers had thus also invaded the Phaedra Legend.

We have yet to consider one difference between the T.J. and the Phaedra Legend. It is not the son of the concubine, but the concubine herself from whom Joseph, unlike the Euripidean nurse, fears the danger which threatens the children of the suicide. This small adjustment is easily understood if we consider that for the Jewish narrator there was no reason to introduce quite unnecessarily the son of a concubine, as Joseph has taken over the part of the *vóthos* Hippolytus: the concubine herself is for the narrator the only possible future torturer of the children. The conflict between stepmother and stepchild has thus taken the place of the opposition between *vóthos* and his 'stepbrothers'.

This contrast has also survived in the post-Euripidean Phaedra Legend. According to Pausanias (I. 22.2), Theseus sends Hippolytus to Troezen because he fears a conflict between him and Phaedra's children. In Ovid's *Heroides*, Phaedra is so devoid of scruples that she incites the *nothos* Hippolytus against Theseus by the reference to his 'brothers'

¹ A Jewish story of a stepmother is to be found in M. Gaster, *The Exempla of the Rabbis*, 1924, No. 450, p. 182: 'Akiba married a bad woman. Jealous of her step-daughter, she paid the washer-man to take the girl away and kill her and told the daughter to follow him with the clothes, etc. . . .'

² *Phaed.* I. 638 (cf. I. 697). Hippolytus addresses her as *mo* Ovid, *Heroid.* IV. 140; Propert. II. 1. 51 f.

See also

(IV. 122-124): ' . . . why, unless that you, a bastard, should not come to your father's throne? He has bestowed brothers on you, too, from me, and the cause of rearing them all as heirs has been not myself, but he.' In Seneca, on the contrary, Hippolytus is an affectionate brother to the sons of Phaedra (ll. 631-633): 'With due affection', he says, 'will I care for my dear brothers, and so deserve of thee that thou shalt not deem thee widowed, and myself will fill for thee my father's place.' This over-emphasis on the affectionate and unselfish attitude of Hippolytus is best understood in contrast to the usual version, according to which there was enmity between him and Phaedra's children.

The Egyptian woman misunderstands the motive which prompts Joseph to warn her not to commit suicide. She cries out to him: 'You love me, and I am certain that you will satisfy my desire.' Joseph, in referring to this, points the moral: if one fall a prey to a desire and become its slave, he will turn even the good that he hears into a further inducement towards that evil desire. This fine psychological analysis is unique in biblical and apocryphal literature. We find similar reflections chiefly in Greek romances. These abound in general maxims on the nature of love and the mental condition of those who have become its slaves. Above all, they stress again and again the fact that man, particularly when in love, believes and expects only too readily that which he longs for.

VIII. The woman bares her arms, breasts, and legs to break down Joseph's resistance. She was beautiful, and had adorned herself with seductive charm. But the Lord saved Joseph from her attempts at seduction.

What we present here as Episode VIII is in the T.J. an afterthought in chap. 9 (Joseph in prison). It is very clumsily intercalated, and proves again the inability of the author to build up the action logically.¹

That a woman, with erotic intention, bares her body—even if only partially—before a man is a *motif*, which does

¹ A more experienced narrator would also not have waited till the end of the story to disclose the fact that the woman was beautiful, a feature which is non-existent in Gen. 39.12. Genesis, however, *Joseph's* beauty is mentioned immediately before the Potiphar Story (xxxix. 6), cf. Braun, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

not occur in the Greek Romance as drastically as in the T.J., for decency is one of its foremost laws. We meet this *motif* only on one occasion, and that is in Xenophon of Ephesus, I. 3.2: with loud voice and partial uncovering of her body, Anthea seeks to attract the attention of Habrocomes.¹ It is an act of desperate love, bordering on vulgarity. While decent and harmless in comparison with T.J. 9.5, it is very offensive if compared to the usual propriety of the heroine of a Greek novel. The extent of prudery in this respect is best shown in Heliodorus, X. 15: Chariclea must prove her royal descent by a birthmark. Sisimithres asks her to bare her arm. It is very significant that he thinks fit to add: οὐδὲν ἀπρεπὲς γυμνούμενον τὸ φύπων καὶ γένους μαρτύριον. This embarrassing consciousness of the veiling of nudity is as typically Oriental as the lascivious display of nudity: it is well known that not only the temple prostitution in honour of Ishtar-Astarte, but also monastic institutions originated in the Orient. Crude exhibition of nudity and its very strict concealment, lasciviousness and asceticism, are two extremes in the attitude of Hellenistic-Oriental society. The Greek author, being bound by the established law of style, was prevented from introducing into a romance an obscene episode like T.J. 9.5.²

It is a commonplace of Hellenistic-Oriental literature that the woman adorns herself lavishly to seduce a youth.³ Examples are superfluous in this case. We wish only to recall that, according to Talmud B. Yoma 35 b, the Egyp-

¹ Compare also the peculiar situation in Ach. Tat. IV. 9.2. The romance of Longus, because of its pastoral character, holds a special position. Especially in the bathing scenes of this romance the psychological situation is rendered more delicately: the maiden, still inexperienced in love, naïvely admires and caresses the beautiful body of her fellow-shepherd, Daphnis.

² Works of a different literary genre, e.g., the mimes of Herondas, are characterized by extreme coarseness and obscenity of language and action. We may also assume that the older *novella* was less prudish and less 'moral' than the later romance in general, with the exception in some degree of Achilles Tatius. For instance, the fact that a man spies on a woman while she bathes is an old theme of the *novella*, the use of which in the romance of later times—Longus occupies an exceptional position—has been discontinued (see pp. 96 f.). Cf. Kerényi, *op. cit.*, p. 225. The situation which we find in the Neaera story is also very bold: at night the woman orders that she be locked into a bedchamber with the unwilling youth and successfully employs 'πολλὰ ἐπαγωγὰ' (Parthenius, XVIII, see pp. 94 f.). Cf. Philo, *De Virt.* §§39 f.

³ This feature has also been taken over by Christian hagiography, see Rabbow in *Wiener Studien*, XVII., 1895, pp. 257, 272 f., 280.

tian woman changed apparel twice daily to find favour with Joseph.¹

There are few facts worthy of notice in the remainder of the narrative.

Joseph is not only put into prison by his master, but also flagellated (8.4). This happens to another victim of calumny, Habrocomes (Xen. Eph. II. 6.2 ff.).

The Egyptian woman often sends to Joseph and informs him that she will free him from prison, if he will appease her desire (9.1). Thus Cybele, the confidant of Arsace, frequently visits Theagenes in prison to find out whether his imprisonment and castigations have made him more amenable (Heliod. VIII. 6).

The Egyptian woman herself frequently comes at night to see Joseph.² The same is done by the unfortunate Melite in the novel of Achilles Tatius. She promises the obdurate Clitophon escape, freedom and re-union with his beloved, if he will but once give in to her desire (V. 26.10 f.). Clitophon is less adamant than Joseph and the other heroes in Greek romances. Visits by women at night to prisons occur also in the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.³

Having analysed the individual episodes, we have now to consider the sequence as a whole.

It is a sequence which arbitrarily begins here and ends there. It might be shorter, but it might also be longer. Introductory phrases, such as 'ποσάκις,' 'πολλάκις,' 'καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ χρόνῳ,' 'καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο,' 'ἔτι δέ,' 'τέλος,' are characteristic of the author's style which, in a most primitive manner, joins episode to episode. He is able to effect only external transitions. And even where one episode links up more closely with the preceding one, the connecting threads are still purely external (see p. 58). The episodical narrative style of the Bible, of which the story of the Ten Plagues is a good example (Exodus, vii.—xii.), appears here to have badly degenerated. For the scenic sequence is not only without cohesion, but in parts quite

¹ Quoted in Charles, *The Testaments*, p. 182.

² We must not lose sight of the possibility that T.J. 9.4 has nothing to do with Joseph's imprisonment, but refers to a previous situation (cf. 3.6, pp. 50 f.).

³ See R. Söder, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike*. (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, III., 1932), pp. 134-5, 144.

illogically and arbitrarily arranged. Thus in Episode II the woman pursues the youth with her 'mother-love', without his seeing through her subterfuge at first. This, after Episode I, is quite incomprehensible and out of place. The misconception of the youth is only possible at the beginning of the seduction story. In such manner do we read it, not only in Heliodorus' Demaenete story (I.9), but also in Firdausi's *Yussuf and Suleika*.¹ Firdausi displays the psychologically delicate trait that at first Suleika really does feel mother-love for the boy Yussuf, which develops into sensual passion when the boy grows into a man. In general, he has provided the story which in his poem, too, is composed of several episodes of seduction with a dramatic and logical sequence, of which there is scarcely any trace in the T.J. In the latter we are confronted with raw materials which have been sketchily put into literary shape. As may be expected, contradictions and other deficiencies emerged, when the alien narrative material was joined to the old story. Another example of the inner inconsistencies which can arise from the adoption of an alien subject is contained in the Jewish story about the contest of the three pages.² Within the Christian apocrypha we have an analogous case in the Rhode episode of the *Shepherd of Hermas*.³

The student of the history of literature is often attracted by those very works which displease the aesthetist. The T.J. is such a document. In spite of, nay, because of, its literary insufficiency, it arrests our attention. Wherein lies its great value?

The Potiphar Story of Genesis has all the characteristics of a *novella*. At the stage of development which is represented by the T.J., this biblical *novella* has turned into a cycle of episodes. It is not by chance that the elements of

¹ A knowledge of the works of the great Persian poet, even in translation only, is sufficient to make us realize that he sometimes strikingly resembles Euripides. Seneca, Heliodorus, Apuleius, etc., in short, the Hellenistic narrative tradition. The *Syntipas Romance*, too, appears to be influenced by the latter. This Oriental book of folk-lore was translated into Greek in the eleventh century A.D. from a Syriac or Arabic text, but the story was, of course, current in the East long before. Its version of the Phaedra-Potiphar legend has much in common with those we discussed above, cf. *Fabulae Romanenses*, ed. A. Eberhard, I., 1872, Teubner, pp. 552-554. See R. La

romance have gained a hold just where the biblical story characteristically discloses the marks of a *novella*; for averse to all repetitions, like every true *novella*, Genesis xxxix. 10, records only very summarily the repeated attempts at seduction by the Egyptian woman (see p. 47). The Potiphar Story of the T.J. has alienated itself to a surprising extent, not only in the subject-matter, but also in literary character from its biblical basis, the *novella*, so that something entirely different has come into being; a longer narrative which has much in common with what we call a romance.

This development is important on a matter of principle, because it disproves in practice E. Rohde's contention that romance and *novella* are categories divided by such a deep gulf that no romance could ever develop from a *novella*. This dogma has already rightly been opposed by O. Schissel v. Fleschenberg, B. Lavagnini, and B. E. Perry.¹ Perry, particularly, has propounded the very plausible theory that many of the earlier romances were nothing but enlargements and elaborations of legends or *Milesian Tales*.² It is, however, unfortunate that there is so extraordinarily little material left from the pre-rhetorical stage of development of the Greek romance. For instance, there is good reason to assume that a Parthenope Romance was built up on the Parthenope Legend,³ but of the latter we possess only a few meagre references and of the former only some scanty bits of papyri. The position is as bad, or not much better, with regard to the early stages of development of the Ninus, Chione,⁴ and Callirrhoe Romances. Everywhere we lack really comparable texts which would present the same subject-matter in different phases of development. So far as we can see, the Potiphar Story is the only ancient subject-matter which offers this opportunity of comparison: in Genesis we read a *novella* which is related with the simple skill of archaic art; in the T.J. a romantic presentation which

¹ Schissel v. Fleschenberg, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romans*, 1913, pp. 1 ff. Lavagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 98. Perry in *American Journal of Philology*, LI., 1930, p. 112, note 29.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 111-2, note 29. Cf. Wilcken in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, I., 1901, p. 257.

³ See Lavagnini, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 ff. Rattenbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 237 ff. Zimmermann in *Philologus*, N. F., XLIV., 1935, pp. 194 ff.

⁴ See Rattenbury, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff., 230 ff.

is comprehensible only on the background of popular Hellenistic-Oriental romances; finally, in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, a masterpiece of rhetorical technique which imitates the style of the rhetorical Greek romance down to the smallest detail.¹ The three versions of the Potiphar Story thus reflect in unique fashion the general trend of development: from the *novella* or legend, by way of the popular 'romance,' to the rhetorical romance.

With regard to the date of the emergence of the Greek romance, it is doubtful whether one can draw any conclusion referring to this problem from the analysed part of the T.J. The individual *motifs* might have found their way into the Potiphar Story equally well from novels as from *novelle*, or cycles of *novelle*. But was there at that time a type of novel at all in which the love-affairs of the hero played a prominent part? That is the decisive question. The Ninus Romance, in which the erotic element is already strongly developed, could be regarded as evidence thereof. It originated most probably in the first century B.C., while for good reasons the T.J. have been dated at the end of the second century B.C. It will be evident—provided always that the chronology is correct—that there is no great time-interval between the T.J. and the Ninus Romance. It is, therefore, quite possible that novels of a stronger erotic trend existed already in the second century B.C. Be that as it may, it is of importance to establish the fact that in a relatively early Jewish document a large number of *motifs* have been incorporated, which in Greek and Roman novels are only to be found at a much later date. The T.J. is, therefore, an extraordinarily valuable witness for the existence of a whole prose literature of novelistic character which has been lost to us. It is, perhaps, the oldest novelistic and erotic document of larger proportions that has been handed down to us from the Hellenistic-Oriental narrative literature.

The classical scholar, who is generally concerned with Greek and Latin texts, easily runs the risk of forgetting that the nations of the Hellenistic East never ceased to speak their own languages² and to lead a national life concomitant

¹ See Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 ff.

² Cf. K. Holl in *Hermes*, XLIII., 1908, pp. 240 ff.

with the universal Greek culture. How did Hellenism affect the more or less impregnable nations of the Orient? And, in turn, how did these react? We may only hope to attain a more comprehensive grasp of the phenomenon of Hellenism when our view embraces simultaneously its antipodes, namely, the various national entities. It is an unfortunate state of things, however, that we know little or nothing of the thought and traditions of the Oriental nations. Their lips are almost silent, and because of this silence we hear all the more clearly the voice of Judaism. Jewish literature has been preserved to a fair extent, partly in translations, and partly in the Hebrew or Aramaic originals of the later portions of the O.T. and of the older Rabbinical tradition. This offers singularly valuable material for research into the question of the clash between Hellenism and the various national entities.

The resistance of the best among the Jewish people against Antiochus Epiphanes' policy of Hellenization, and their victorious war of liberation under the Maccabees, are well-known. The anti-Greek exclusiveness of the Pharisees, who were the intellectual leaders of Palestinian Jewry, has also been sufficiently described. It is, however, considerably less known and appreciated that the language in which the anti-Greek Pharisaism immortalized itself, the language of the Mishna¹ and kindred literature, displays such an abundance of Greek words as to show that the Palestinian Jew was on exceedingly intimate terms with the Hellenistic universal culture which surrounded him. One can even take for granted that a knowledge of Greek among the Jews of Palestine was wide-spread.² Nothing would be more erroneous than to identify the upholding of Jewish individuality with complete isolation from the Hellenistic world.³

That we can hardly adopt such a view is seen quite clearly from the literary document analysed by us, which—as must always be remembered—was taken from a Palestinian work, originally written in Hebrew. The facts which

¹ Cf. P. Fiebig, *Das Griechisch der Mishna*, in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, IX., 1908, pp. 297 ff.

² Cf. A. E. Silverstone, *Aquila and Onkelos*, 1931, pp. 148-153.

³ See Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 ff., 109 f., 127 ff. W. L. Knox's chapter 'Pharisaism and Hellenism,' in *Judaism and Christianity*, II., 1937, edited by H. Loewe, pp. 61-111.

it discloses to us are an instructive contribution to our knowledge of the tension between Hellenism and Judaism: the alien narrative material has been taken over, but at the same time has been radically adapted to the spirit of Jewish piety and morality. Whereas, for instance, Josephus, originally a Palestinian, but in the Diaspora writing in Greek, made of the Potiphar Story a tale in the style and psychology of a Greek novel episode, from which all specific Jewish features are removed, in the T.J., the older Hebrew document belonging to Palestinian Judaism, the Jewish character has been preserved, in spite of all alien subject-matter. While the paraphrase of Josephus is an excellent example of the extreme Hellenization of a biblical tale, the story as retold in the T.J. bears witness to another method and degree of Hellenistic influence which applies only to the subject-matter, but not to style, ethics, or spiritual content.

Moreover, what has been made apparent by the paraphrase of Josephus (namely, that the rich Hellenistic tradition of Phaedra and Hippolytus and similar figures strongly influenced the briefly-related biblical Potiphar Story)¹ is confirmed by the T.J. But it also forces us to the conclusion that this elaboration was not originally the work of comparatively highly-cultured *literati* of the type of Josephus, but must be traced back to popular narrators of Hebrew or Aramaic Haggadoth; for the T.T. belong to the *genre* of popular didactic literature. To Josephus fell primarily the task of making a selection in consonance with the taste of Hellenistic culture from the wealth of accumulated themes, and of constructing the action dramatically, according to the rules of rhetorical technique.

It would be erroneous, however, to regard Josephus as a continuator or artistic perfecter of Haggadic traditions. While he remodels the biblical and Haggadic subjects as he retells them, he deprives them of their original individuality. He is thus the antithesis of a Haggadoth narrator, with whom he merely shares the subject-matter. We are confronted with two different historically-conditioned types of narrators, of which in late Jewish antiquity

¹ See Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 ff.

that of the Haggadoth narrator was destined to survive that of the assimilated writer, such as Josephus. The difference between them can be briefly outlined as follows: Josephus Hellenizes biblical and Haggadic tales, so that they become something completely new and different, while the Haggadoth narrator Judaizes alien elements, as the material of the Phaedra tradition, adopted in the T.J., shows so well.

Pausanias once remarks: 'Everybody, even a foreigner (*ὅστις βαρβάρων*) who has learnt the Greek tongue, knows about the love of Phaedra and the wickedness the nurse dared commit to serve her.'¹ This can only mean that the Phaedra Legend was so well-known throughout the Hellenistic world that to get acquainted with it a 'barbarian' required no familiarity with Greek literature; knowledge of the Greek language alone was sufficient. No 'barbarian,' having mastered the Greek tongue, had not heard the story of Phaedra. Its great popularity and oral transmission from the Greeks to the 'barbarians' is in itself highly probable, and is expressly confirmed by the evidence of Pausanias. This must, of course, be supplemented by the consideration that the subject-matter was transmitted to their compatriots in their own tongue by the 'barbarians' who knew the Greek language, and so after certain transformations it became a part of their own national traditions. In this way, we may infer, it came to Syria and to the Jews in Palestine. That Hippolytus and similar heroes could not keep their place beside Joseph can well be understood: the Potiphar Story absorbed the abundantly developed alien subject-matter.

The question as to whether this absorption took place gradually, or whether one individual Jewish narrator, necessarily very familiar with the current Hellenistic novel production, introduced the new versions into the Potiphar Story, can be answered only conjecturally. The former alternative is the more probable if one agrees with the following reasoning: the contradictions and the lack of coherence between the various episodes in the T.J. are not sufficiently explained by literary inexperience, but are better accounted for as survivals from the gradual process of

¹ I. 22.1. Cf. Rohde, *op. cit.*, p. 32, note 4.

growth in which the different themes attached themselves to the Potiphar Story.

However, the acknowledgment of this possibility, or even probability, must not lead to a misconception of the literary problem, which is that surely at some given time a number of Haggadic versions of the Potiphar Story were united into a cycle. This means the conversion of the biblical *novella* into a tale drawn out almost to novel length. As the literary framework for it, one can imagine either a more extensive Joseph Romance, or a Haggadic paraphrase of the Genesis. However this may be, there can be no doubt that the author of the T.J., the pious preacher, for whom the chief importance of the story lies in its didactic aspect, never created such a novelistic Haggadic cycle, but simply adopted and modelled it for his literary purpose. He worked on material already collected and, however primitively, already formed. It seems that in the selection and arrangement of the individual episodes from his Haggadic source, he must have worked with equal inaptitude and traditionalism, and we may assume that his redaction increased still further the contradictions of his source.

Though the cycle in the T.J. is the richest ancient collection of narrative *motifs* of the Potiphar Story, it can easily be shown that it is still only a selection from an even greater wealth. Thus it lacks the detail of the feast so closely connected with the Phaedra Legend and some of its variants, which is well known to occur constantly in Hellenistic poetry and fiction. We find it in Josephus' paraphrase (*Ant.* II, §45), and in Midrashic and Talmudic versions of the Potiphar Story.¹ Doubtless, it had long been incorporated into the Haggadic store of the Potiphar Story. The following case is also instructive: in a Milesian story of the type of the Phaedra Legend, which has been handed down to us by Parthenius (XVIII), and originates from Theophrastus, we read that Neaera orders that she is to be locked into a chamber with a youth who is adamant to all persuasion. The presentation of the Potiphar Story in the Book of Jubilees, which belongs to the same period as the T.T. (about the end

¹ See Braun, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-52.

of the second century B.C.), contains a very similar incident, except that Joseph remains more intractable and breaks the door (XXXIX. 8 f.). This detail of the door, which later reappears in the 12th Surah of the Koran, is missing from the T.J. It cannot, of course, be ascertained whether the author has abbreviated his source,¹ or whether the missing themes were familiar to other versions of the 'Joseph Romance'. In any case, the cycle analysed by us may be regarded as indicating a still wider Haggadic tradition.

We may now advance a step: the Potiphar Story is not an isolated case within the Jewish literature of Hellenistic times; instead, it is only an especially well-developed branch of a series of similar narratives. We shall now turn to them with the object of demonstrating a uniform stratum of Hellenistic-Oriental fiction.

As the cycle of the T.J. brings something like variations on the theme of a very summary verse in Genesis (xxxix. 10, see pp. 47, 89), so in the tales to be discussed, the Haggadah steps in where the biblical text tends to be laconically brief, incomplete, and sketchy.

The biblical tradition of Reuben's crime against Bilhah, the concubine of his father, has a counterpart in the Phoenix story of the *Iliad* (IX. 447 ff.). But while the Greek canto gives a brief yet connected account of the outrage and damnation of Phoenix, only scanty hints of this painful episode have been transmitted to us in Genesis (xxxv. 22 after Gunkel): 'Now when Israel dwelt in that country, Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father's concubine. But when Israel heard this That this action cost Reuben the loss of his rights as the firstborn follows only from a casual reference in the 'Blessing of Jacob' (Genesis xxxix. 3 f.). Later narrators tended to build up a connected Reuben-Bilhah story, which they enriched by introducing certain novelistic features.² In the Book of Jubilees (XXXIII.

¹ In T. Reub. 4.9, we read that the Egyptian woman called in magicians (cf. p. 62). In T.J., on the other hand, they are not even mentioned. The magicians in T. Reub. are therefore a survival of a richer tradition. At the same time, we note the casual way in which the author employs a detail and drops it again.

² In the *Antiquities*, Josephus is silent over the painful incident. In the Rabbinical literature Reuben is vindicated: he has merely disordered Bilhah's bed, and that out of anger at the neglect of his mother. This is the same motive as is found in the Homeric Phoenix story. Compare also the Phineus story (Diod. IV. 43-4).

2), as well as in the T. Reub. (3.11 f.), it is related that Reuben falls in love with Bilhah when he sees her bathing in a hidden spot. Though the Book of Jubilees and the T. belong approximately to the same period, it is highly probable that the story of T. Reub. represents a more recent stage of development. The following are the pertinent differences and indications. In the Book of Jubilees it is simply stated: 'and he loved her,' but in the T. Reub. it is put in a much more complicated manner: 'For my mind taking in the thought of the woman's nakedness, suffered me not to sleep until I had wrought the abominable thing.' This aspect of the latter version is concerned with the phenomenon of psychological compulsion under which a human being becomes a sinner, and, as the compulsion is evoked by the sight of female nakedness, this is already here deemed to be as much of a sinful influence as in any later monastic legend. Furthermore, in the T. Reub. the *motif* of seductive nakedness is duplicated: apart from the bathing scene, Reuben beholds Bilhah as she is lying unveiled and drunken in her chamber, which is also a new *motif* (cf. the story of Noah's drunkenness, Genesis ix. 21); and he commits the sin on the innocently sleeping woman (cf. the story of Lot's daughters, Genesis xix. 31 ff.). Finally, the following difference should be considered. While in the Book of Jubilees Bilhah herself reports to Jacob the misdeed of Reuben, this task in the more complicated version of the T. Reub., as Bilhah is ignorant of it all, falls to the 'revealing angel' already familiar to us (see p. 57).

We are interested chiefly in the *motif* of the bathing woman, common to both versions. The best proof of its popularity is the fact that it is also found amongst the novelistic enlargements in the Theodotion text of the Susanna Legend. In contrast to the older Septuagint version, in which the two elders approach Susanna, who is walking in her garden, and try to violate her, the situation in the more recent version has been so rearranged that they spy upon her, while she is bathing in the deserted park. The *motif* also occurs in the Christian apocryphal literature. Thus we read in a Coptic *Act of Peter*: 'And an exceeding rich man, by name Ptolemaeus, when he had seen the maiden

with her mother bathing, sent unto her to take her to wife.¹ In the *Shepherd of Hermas*, it is said at the very beginning (I. 1-2): 'He who brought me up sold me to a certain Rhoda at Rome. After many years I made her acquaintance again, and began to love her as a sister. After some time I saw her bathing in the river Tiber, and gave her my hand and helped her out of the river. When I saw her beauty I reflected in my heart and said: "I should be happy if I had a wife of such beauty and character." This was my only thought, and no other, no, not one.' M. Dibelius has discussed this introductory part in his excellent commentary on the book.² Most probably the author of the *Shepherd* adopted a Greek novelistic theme which he succeeded in reshaping in the Christian spirit, but not without inconsistencies in fitting it into the general situation of his narrative. The *motif* of the bathing woman is to be found not only in Jewish, but also in Hellenistic literature.³ In this case an originally Oriental narrative *motif* has possibly wandered westwards. It is an obviously novelistic feature in the story of David and Bathsheba, when it is related in 2 Sam. xi. 2 that one evening the king saw from the roof of his palace a very beautiful woman bathing. It is interesting also that in an Egyptian love song (New Kingdom) the maiden sings: 'My brother, it is pleasant to go the (pond) in order to bathe me in thy presence, that I may let thee see my beauty in my tunic of finest royal linen, when it is wet. . . .'⁴

Another novelistic creation, indubitably dating back to the pre-Christian era, is the tale of Moses and Tharbis, related in the *Antiquities* of Josephus (II, §§252-3). This story is based upon the rather obscure biblical reference, Numbers xii. 1, where the Cushite or Ethiopian (LXX.) wife of Moses is mentioned. H. Grossmann is, perhaps, right when he assumes that the Cushite is none other than the Midianite Zipporah who is insulted by Aaron and Miriam as being a 'negress.'⁵ The identity of Zipporah

¹ M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 1924, p. 301. E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 1904, p. 392.

² *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 1923, pp. 427 ff.

³ See Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 430. R. Reitzenstein, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche*, 1912, pp. 29 f.

⁴ Quoted from Kerényi, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

⁵ *Die Anfänge Israels*, 1922, p. 96.

and the Cushite is also assumed in Rabbinical literature, though with less realistic argument.¹ But the verse was and remained a *crux*.² We can still realize how uncertain and varied was its interpretation amongst the Jews of late antiquity. Philo, in the *Life of Moses*, is significantly silent on this point; in another writing he gives an allegorical interpretation to 'Αἰθιοπίσσα' (*Leg. Alleg.* II, §67). On the other hand, the Palestinian Targum is positively against the view that the Cushite should be identified with Moses' wife Zipporah.³ The same view is already the basis of our story in which the 'Cushite' appears as an individual, a real Cushite-Ethiopian woman named Tharbis. When and on what occasion did Moses take an Ethiopian woman as his wife? It is this 'gap' in the biblical account which has been filled in novelistic manner by the Tharbis story.

Moses, so we read, besieges in the course of a victorious campaign against the Ethiopians the royal city of Saba, practically impregnable by nature and fortification. Fortune comes to his aid. Tharbis, the Ethiopian king's daughter, had learnt to admire his gallantry and resourcefulness when she saw him discharge his duties as commander during the siege, and she loves him with violent passion. When this grows greater and greater, she sends her most trusted slaves to him and offers him marriage. Moses agrees on condition that the city be surrendered to him. This done, in accordance with the agreements made on his oath, Moses marries the Ethiopian princess, of whom thereafter no more is heard.

P. Wendland has already shown that this tale belongs to a series of stories which are modelled on the type of the Greek Scylla Legend: Scylla, Comaetho, Leucophrye, and others, out of avarice or love for the hostile commander, betray their native city.⁴ Krappe and Mielentz have since collected and dealt with the material of the variants.⁵ It is significant that

¹ See *Jewish Enc.*, XII., p. 687. A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1928, pp. 199, 361. Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

² This verse is a difficulty also to modern biblical critics. See, e.g., B. Baentsch, *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*, 1903, pp. 511-2.

³ The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch; with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum, translated by J. W. Etheridge, 1865, p. 377.

⁴ *De fabellis antiquis earumque ad Christianos propagatione*, Prog. Göttingen, 1911, p. 18.

⁵ Krappe in *Rheinisches Museum*, LXXVIII., 1929, pp. 249 ff. Mielentz, article 'Tarpeia' in *R.E.*, 2nd series, IV., pp. 2337-8.—The Antiope story which conforms

the only essential feature in which the narrative of Josephus deviates from the Graeco-Roman parallels is that the Jewish warrior loyally marries the Ethiopian princess according to the agreements, instead of in his turn betraying the traitress. Furthermore, a glance at the material of the variants shows another remarkable fact. We see that the plot of the Scylla Legend is not confined to Moses and Tharbis,¹ but has been also ascribed to Cyrus and Nanis, to Titus Tatius and Tarpeia, to Brennus and Demonice. That is to say, testifying to the uniformity of the narrative material and to that of the imagination of writers and readers, the same story has penetrated in Hellenistic times the traditions of the various national heroes.

We shall now consider a question of literary-historical import which arises from the fact that the Tharbis episode forms a part of the Jewish-Hellenistic Moses romance. This 'romance', the novelistic development of Moses' life in Hellenistic times and chiefly in the Egyptian Diaspora, has been preserved—apart from Philo's *Vita Mosis*—in two versions, whose close connection by origin is not to be doubted. The more recent is that of Josephus, the other of Artapanus. Both relate, amongst other matters, the Ethiopian campaign of Moses, but only in Josephus does this end in the Tharbis story; in Artapanus we hear nothing of Moses' marriage to the Ethiopian princess.² How are we to explain this divergence of two closely connected accounts? One

very closely to the Tharbis story appears to have been overlooked: Hercules and Theseus besiege in vain the city of Themiscyra on the Thermodon. Then the Amazon Antiope falls in love with Theseus and surrenders the city to them (Paus. I. 2.1).

¹ According to Targum pseudo-Jonathan (in Etheridge's translation pp. 376 f.), Moses had married the queen of Cush-Ethiopia and later had divorced her. This interpretation of Numbers xii. 1 presupposes a knowledge of the Tharbis story—the name does not matter—which, we must assume, had travelled from Egypt to Palestine. The *Midrash* conforms in other features with the Jewish-Hellenistic Moses tradition, cf. Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 171 ff., Heinemann in *R.E.*, XVI., pp. 370-1. These features, too, may have originated largely in Egypt. As there was in a Palestinian Joseph 'romance', so also there was a Palestinian Moses 'romance', in which the biblical report had been enriched by numerous Hellenistic-Oriental narrative motifs. It is hard to say to what extent the early medieval book of legends, *Sefer ha-Yashar*, is based on this older Palestinian Moses tradition. There it is recorded, amongst other things, that Moses, as the husband of the Ethiopian queen, ruled over Ethiopia for forty years. See Freudenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 172. M. Gaster, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 1899, p. LXXXIX.

² *Jos. Ant.* II, §5243 ff. (Tharbis story: §5252-3). Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* IX. 27, pp. 432 c—433 a.

possibility must immediately be ruled out, the one which I. Heinemann considers in his valuable article on *Moses*, namely, that Josephus himself has freely added the story.¹ As regards Heinemann's point that the detailed treatment of the Potiphar Story shows how much such a 'romance' would correspond to the taste of Josephus, our research on this story has clearly proved that here also Josephus depends on older legendary products, and that his work has been chiefly concerned with the selection and composition of given material.² In other words, it is just the evidence of the Potiphar Story which favours the assumption that the Tharbis story also has been merely taken over, not invented, by Josephus. However, Heinemann is circumspect enough to reckon also with the possibility that the Tharbis story originates from a kindred predecessor of Josephus. That this predecessor must be pre-Artapanean has already been rightly maintained by I. Lévy.³ Was it Artapanus himself, or one of the later writers, Alexander Polyhistor or Eusebius, who quoted him, who removed the episode of Moses' Ethiopian marriage from the Moses romance? In support of Lévy's theory that Artapanus himself abbreviated the report in this as in other passages, we should like to adduce the following considerations.⁴ It must be our starting point that the equivalent of Josephus' Tharbis story is more or less the words in Artapanus 'λυθέντος τοῦ πολέμου' (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.*, IX. 27, p. 433a). There can be no doubt that they indicate the abbreviation of a longer report in which the Ethiopian marriage of Moses was most probably related. This brevity and vagueness must disappoint every reader who expects concrete facts about the result and conclusion of the war. But the preceding report about the campaign itself is just as disappointing. Though the war, according to Artapanus, is supposed to have lasted ten years, his account of the military action is far poorer and less informative than the Josephus version. To Artapanus, events of cultural and ritual interest, viz. the foundation of Helio-

¹ *R.E.*, XVI., p. 374.

² See p. 92.

³ *Revue des Études Juives*, LIII., 1907, pp. 202 ff., 210.

⁴ I am in disagreement with S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*, 1930, p. 117, note 142. The same applies to his views expressed on pp. 28 f.

polis, the Ibis-worship there, as well as the adoption of the practice of circumcision by the Ethiopians and the (Egyptian) priests, are of more importance than the operations of warfare. The fact that the Ibis-worship was founded owing to the part played by the birds in a military stratagem of Moses against the Ethiopians would be unknown to us without the parallel report of Josephus (*Ant.* II, §§246 f.), who here again—as at the conclusion of the war (Tharbis story)—supplements and elucidates the account of Artapanus. Considering, then, that the Artapanus fragments show on the whole a one-sided tendency to place emphasis on religious and cultural events, we assume, with great probability, that he and no other has undertaken the abbreviations mentioned above. In other words, from his source, richer in warlike and erotic events, to which the one of Josephus has been closely related, Artapanus has taken over in general only facts of religious and cultural significance. Neither Freudenthal, Lévy, nor Heinemann, have thought—and they were right—that the responsibility for the cuttings should be placed upon Eusebius, who is known for his integrity in handing down literary traditions, and who has preserved for us the Alexander Polyhistor excerpts of Artapanus. It has been proved by Lévy against Freudenthal that it was not Alexander Polyhistor, but Artapanus himself who abridged the Ibis matter to the point of incomprehensibility. As far as the Tharbis episode is concerned, it seems remarkable to me that Alexander Polyhistor has related a similar erotic tale 'ἐν τρίτῳ Ἰταλικῶν,' the story of Cathetus who, being passionately in love, abducted the fair Salia, daughter of the Etruscan King Annius.¹ This specimen of literary taste, which is characteristic of the historian or pseudo-historian of the Hellenistic period, leads us to assume that Alexander Polyhistor would never have omitted the Tharbis story, if it had been present in Artapanus.

Finally, with all due caution, we should yet like to put forward one observation which indicates that Artapanus' work—in spite of all his remodelling and abbreviations—offers us a survival of the original version. For, as the last event of the Ethiopian war that Artapanus deems worthy

¹ Plutarch, *Parall. Min.* 40 B (315 EF) = *F. H. Gr.*, III., p. 230.

of relating, he reports that the Ethiopians, although enemies, 'loved' (στέρεαι) Moses so much that they even learnt the rite of circumcision from him. The words immediately following 'τὸν δὲ Χεφεφρῆν, λυθέντος τοῦ πολέμου . . . ' mark a break, and lead up to new events. One cannot deny that the 'love' of the Ethiopians and the resulting adoption of circumcision is completely incomprehensible and out of place in the connection reported by Artapanus. In our view, the facts become more intelligible when one remembers that Tharbis, the daughter of the enemy king, falls in love with Moses, comes to an agreement with him, and puts an end to the war. Has Artapanus transferred the *motif* of the love of Tharbis to the whole of the Ethiopian people? Or was the original connection perhaps the following: the Ethiopians adopt circumcision out of love for Moses, but they do so only after peace is made, therefore not as enemies. In the latter case Artapanus has only antedated the love of the Ethiopians; it is even more certain that this would be so with regard to the circumcision. If the latter be the case, it must be admitted that this antedating of the love of the Ethiopians is tantamount to a direct substitution for the Tharbis story. Artapanus has enhanced the fame of his hero to incredible heights by letting him win, while the war is still on, the hearts of all Ethiopians, an achievement far greater than the winning of the love of one princess.¹

The legend of Balaam's wicked counsel will be dealt with here as the last specimen of Jewish legendary formation which is based on the combination and novelistic development of brief biblical references. In Numbers xxv. 1-6, the intercourse of the Israelites with the women of Moab and Midian (cf. xxxi. 9 ff.), and their conversion to Baal Peor are only related as bare facts. In Numbers xxxi. 16, however, we learn from the mouth of Moses that *on Balaam's advice* the Midianite women had alienated the Israelites from Yahve. Again a 'gap' in the biblical account has been filled by a legend. It supplements the information concerning

¹ It should be noted that the events in Artapanus move schematically. The preceding passage ends with the statement that Moses wins the love of the Egyptian people (ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, p. 434 c). The parallelism is all the more complete as, in the preceding passage, the priests secured divine honours to Moses, and here they adopt circumcision for Moses' sake.

Balaam's advice and how it was put into practice. This can be found, not only in Philo and Josephus, but also in the Talmud.² Evidently we are confronted with what is most probably a Palestinian Haggadah of pre-Christian times, which has found its way into Jewish-Hellenistic as well as into Rabbinical literature.

The Rabbinical tradition is as follows: 'Although Balaam had not been able to fulfil Balak's wish and curse Israel, still he did not leave him before giving him advice as to how he might bring ruin to Israel, saying: "The God of this people loathes unchastity; but they are very eager to possess linen garments. Pitch tents, then, and at their entrances have old women offer these articles for sale. Induce them in this way to enter the interior of the tents where they will be surprised by young harlots, who will seduce them to unchastity, so that God may punish them for their sin." . . . The Moabite nation . . . followed Balaam's counsel to tempt Israel to unchastity. . . . If an Israelite passed to buy something of the Moabites, the old women at the entrance to the tent would thus address him: "Dost thou not wish to buy linen garments that were made in Bet-Shan?" Then they would show him a sample of the goods, and name the price, and finally add: "Go within, and thou wilt see wares still more beautiful." If he went within, he was received by a young woman who was richly adorned and perfumed, who would at first set for him a price much lower than the value of the goods, and then invite him to do as if he were at home, and to choose the article he liked best. While he sat there, he was treated with wine, and the young woman invited him to drink with the words: "Why do we love ye while you hate us? Are we not all descendants of one man? Was not Terah our ancestor as much as yours? . . ." But as soon as the Israelite had allowed himself to be persuaded to drink, he was absolutely in the hands of the shameless woman. Intoxicated with wine, his passion for the woman was soon kindled, but she agreed to satisfy his desires only after he had first worshipped Peor, the god of the Moabites . . .'³

² See also Apocalypse, II. 14.

³ We quote the paraphrase of L. Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, III., 1911, pp. 380-1. The most important passage is Talm. Bab. Sanh. 106 a (Talm. Yer. Sanh. X. 18 d). See further Ginsberg, *op. cit.*, VI., 1913, pp. 134-5.

In the rendering of the story by Philo (*Vit. Mos.* I, §§294 ff.; *De Virt.* §§ 34 ff.) and Josephus (*Ant.* IV, §§126 ff.), we miss—as befits the high literary level aspired to by both authors—such everyday details as the predilection of the Israelites for linen garments, the negotiations outside and in the tent, and other features. Both authors, who are quite independent of each other, show instead a strong interest in the erotic psychology upon which is based Balaam's advice. While this problem is not touched upon at all in the Talmud, Philo and Josephus have placed it in the foreground, an attitude which, for a Hellenistic author, whether philosopher or historian, is a matter of course. Naturally, Philo accentuates the moral aspects more strongly than does Josephus.

The development of the action in Josephus' version requires special treatment. Contrary to the versions of Philo and the Talmud, in Josephus the maidens at first surrender to the youths without making any condition. But as soon as they notice that the youths are hopelessly entangled in the web of passion, acting on Balaam's advice, they take steps to leave them (§132). As was foreseen, the amorous youths are ready to grant anything, if they can only induce the young women to stay. They offer them marriage, and as real Hellenistic lovers would, they spare no tears or vows of fidelity. At this dramatic climax the maidens make the condition that the Israelites must worship the native gods, and the youths do not hesitate to fulfil this condition. The narrative *motif* which Josephus has introduced into the Balaam story can already be found in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*. There also the women break off relations with their husbands and threaten to leave them unless they fulfil a certain political condition. In both plots the result of the stratagem is the same: the submission of the men to the demands of the women.